The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit

The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit

and its Impact on World History

Volume I

by

E. Michael Jones

Fidelity Press

South Bend, Indiana

2020

Published by Fidelity Press in South Bend, Indiana
www.fidelitypress.org
(574) 289–9786
Copyright © 2020 by E. Michael Jones
Second Edition, First Printing 2020

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of Fidelity Press.

Printed and bound in the United States of America by Sheridan Press

1 2 3 4 5 6 10 09 08 07 06 05 04

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data

Jones, E. Michael
The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit and its Impact on World History
in three volumes; Volume I of III: 724 pages, 6 x 9 inches
Includes bibliographical references and index

ISBN 978-0-929891-28-6

1. Revolution—World History. 2. Jews—World History.
3. Catholic Church—World History.

Cover art by Timothy Michael Jones
Vol. I: Barabbas, Vol. II: Shabbetai Zevi, Vol. III: Leon Trotsky

Yet what kind of men were they who set their hands to the task [of rebuilding the temple]? They were men who constantly resisted the Holy Spirit, revolutionists bent on stirring up sedition. After the destruction which occurred under Vespasian and Titus, these Jews rebelled during the reign of Hadrian and tried to go back to the old commonwealth and way of life. What they failed to realize was that they were fighting against the decree of God, who had ordered that Jerusalem remain forever in ruins.

– St. John Chrysostom, *Adversos Judaeos*

Christianity did not bring a message of social revolution like that of the ill-fated Spartacus, whose struggle led to so much bloodshed. Jesus was not Spartacus, he was not engaged in a fight for political liberation like Barabbas or Bar-Kochba. Jesus, who himself died on the Cross, brought something totally different: an encounter with the Lord of all lords, an encounter with the living God and thus an encounter with a hope stronger than the sufferings of slavery, a hope which therefore transformed life and the world from within.

– Pope Benedict XVI, *Spe Salvi*

Table of Contents

Preface		13
Introduction		15
Chapter 1	The Synagogue of Satan	27
Chapter 2	The Arian Crisis of the 4th Century	59
Chapter 3	Julian the Apostate and the Doomed Temple	79
Chapter 4	Rome Discovers the Talmud	115
Chapter 5	False Conversion and the Inquisition	157
Chapter 6	The Revolution Arrives in Europe	173
Chapter 7	The Converso Problem	229
Chapter 8	Reuchlin v. Pfefferkorn	251
Chapter 9	Thomas Muentzer and the Peasant Revolt	285
Chapter 10	The Anabaptist Rebellion	323
Chapter 11	John Dee, Magic and the Transformation of England	357
Chapter 12	Menasseh ben Israel and the Failed Apocalypse	443
Chapter 13	The Rise of Freemasonry	509
Chapter 14	The Revolution of 1848	603
Endnotes		641
Index		687

VOLUME I

Preface

On September 21, 2019, I received an e-mail from an American of Armenian extraction hoping to promote better understanding of my writings in the land of his birth. My correspondent envisioned a trip that would take me through the country of Armenia, during which I would meet officials of both Church and state in a land which had the paradoxical nature of being one of the world's youngest states made up of one of the oldest ethnic groups still in existence, rivaling both the Persians, who happened to be Armenia's neighbor to the south, and the Hebrews, another race which recently got its own nation as well.

The trip was scheduled for June 2020, and needless to say, it never took place because the COVID-19 pandemic suspended world travel. Before that happened though, I decided to do some research into a nation about which I knew next to nothing. The next to nothing I knew involved what has come to be known as the Armenian genocide, which I had heard about as a child. My father was born in 1915, the year it took place, and so he was too young and too far away to have any real knowledge of the event, but when he was young and didn't finish the food on his plate, he was told to think of "the starving Armenians," and he conveyed that same admonition to me when I was young.

That was, in effect, all that I knew, but when I started looking into the matter as preparation for my trip, I discovered that I knew more than I thought I knew because I was in possession of the form which made the Armenian story understandable, and that form is the Jewish revolutionary spirit. As I point out in the chapter on that topic in this second edition of *The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit*, discussion of the Armenian genocide has reached a stalemate, with the Turks pointing their finger at the Armenians and vice versa in an ongoing barrage of mutual recrimination. What both sides fail to see is the roots of that conflict in the Jewish revolutionary spirit. Both the Young Turks and the Armenian freedom fighters had roots in the European revolutionary movement which began in earnest in 1848. More importantly, both groups had contact with *Narodnaya Volya*, the world's first Jewish terrorist organization. That contact was direct in the case of the Dashnaks and the Hunchaks, or indirect for the Young Turks, who made contact through Parvus, the wealthy Jewish revolutionary responsible for putting Lenin, like a virus, onto "a sealed train" to take Russia out of the war. But it was undeniable in both instances.

I had no idea that I was going to discover this connection when I began my research into Armenian history. The fact that I made this discovery convinced me that the Jewish revolutionary spirit is more than a category of my mind. It is a category of nature. It is one of the most important categories of nature because it allows us to make sense of the past 2,000 years of human history. In fact, those 2000 years are incomprehensible without this category, which is why I have decided to bring out a second edition of a book I wrote twelve years ago.

In addition to a long chapter on Armenia, which begins Volume II, I have added a chapter on Jewish involvement in the Arian crisis of the 4th century to Volume I. That material fills the gap between the emergence of the Jewish revolutionary spirit at the time of Christ and the story of Julian the Apostate, grandson of the Emperor Constantine, who invoked the Council of Nicaea to resolve the Arian crisis by defining once and for all the relationship of God the Father as "one in being" to God the Son. This chapter was written after the publication of *Logos Rising: A History of Ultimate Reality*, and links the rise of the Jewish revolutionary spirit with the rise of Logos as its antitype.

The bulk of new material in the second edition of *The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit* can be found in the various chapters of Volume III, which were taken from *Culture Wars* articles that explored various aspects of that spirit in contexts as diverse as movie reviews and commentary on current events. The chapter on "Jewish Privilege" appeared first as an article on the punitive legal consequences which flowed from the ill-fated "Unite the Right" rally that took place in Charlottesville in the late summer of 2015. "Jewish Privilege" became a best-seller as an e-book on Amazon Kindle until it was taken down for allegedly violating that bookseller's still unpublished hate speech guidelines. "Nazi Hunters" starts off as a movie review of a recent Amazon Prime series, but ends by dealing with a statement on anti-Semitism by Bishop Kevin Rhoades, ordinary of the diocese of Fort Wayne-South Bend, which encapsulates the Church's current position and why that position needs to change.

If the thesis of *The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit* met the challenges which arose during the first twelve years following its publication, there is reason to believe it will survive the next twelve years as well, just as it proved to be the key to unlocking the door to understanding events where it has never been mentioned. Whether it, in fact, met those challenges is something the reader of the second edition will have to decide, and it is with that in mind that I propose this book to your attention.

E. Michael Jones,
South Bend, Indiana
May 26, 2020

Introduction

The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit

On September 12, 2006, Joseph Ratzinger made a triumphal return to his native Bavaria. Having chosen the name of Benedict XVI when he was elected pope, His Holiness returned not only to Germany but to the German University of Regensburg to express his gratitude for the time he spent there as a professor and to renew the Church's commitment to the university.

But more than that, Pope Benedict wanted to re-affirm the Church's position on the relationship between faith and reason. In order to do that he had to refer to a tradition where that relationship has not been so complementary, a tradition which stands outside of Europe, namely, Islam.

That's where the trouble began, specifically when Benedict quoted the Byzantine emperor Manuel II Paleologos, who felt that the Islamic world and the Christian world had fundamentally different views of the relationship between God and reason. The issue was religiously inspired violence: "Show me just what Mohammed brought that was new and there you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command to spread by the sword the faith he preached."[1]

After an initially favorable response, the world press, including the Arab press, appeared to use the quote to inflame Islamic opinion against the Church. The inflammation was a replay, at least in some ways, of the Danish cartoon crisis of a few months before. In that incident, a Danish magazine editor, with ties to American neoconservatives like Daniel Pipes, ran a series of cartoons that were calculated to outrage Muslims and provoke them to attack Denmark and, by extension, Europe. The purpose of the provocation was to drive Europe, by way of reaction to the Muslim outrage, into the arms of the Americans, who were desperately in need of support for their failing war in Iraq.[2]

In the instance of the Regensburg speech, the outrage surrounding the Manuel II Paleologos quote achieved two ends: first, it strengthened the neoconservative hold over the Catholic mind by giving the impression that Muslims were fanatics determined to wage jihad against both the pope and the Church (the Muslim/Catholic alliance against abortion, which I

personally witnessed at the World Population Conference in Cairo in 1994, gave the opposite impression), and secondly, it obscured the real topic of the talk, which was Logos and the central role it plays in both Europe and the Church.

Unlike Christianity, Islam is not docile to Logos, nor for that matter is Islam's God; God's will is arbitrary, inscrutable. According to Benedict's reading of Manuel II Paleologos, "the decisive statement in this argument against violent conversion is this: not to act in accordance with reason is contrary to God's nature." This idea is not intrinsic to Islam. The "noted French Islamicist R. Arnaldez," Pope Benedict continues, "points out that Ibn Hazm went so far as to state that God is not bound even by his own word, and that nothing would oblige him to reveal the truth to us. Were it God's will, we would even have to practice idolatry."

Christianity is different from Islam in this regard: The Christian God acts with Logos. In using the term Logos, the Pope situates Christianity and, by extension, the European culture which grew up under its influence, in the tradition of Greek philosophy. Greek philosophy is part of God's plan for humanity, something that became clear when St. Paul had to change his plans and travel to Macedonia. Greek philosophy is, in other words, not just Greek; it is universal:

> Is the conviction that acting unreasonably contradicts God's nature merely a Greek idea, or is it always and intrinsically true? I believe that here we can see the profound harmony between what is Greek in the best sense of the word and the biblical understanding of faith in God. Modifying the first verse of the Book of Genesis, the first verse of the whole Bible, John began the prologue of his Gospel with the words: "In the beginning was the logos." This is the very word used by the Emperor: God acts with logos.

"In the beginning was the logos, and the logos is God," says the Evangelist. The marriage of Hebrew scripture and Greek philosophy that begat Christianity and subsequently Europe is not mere coincidence, nor is Greek philosophy some adulteration of an otherwise pure Gospel. Europe means Biblical faith plus Greek thought: Europe is based on Logos. "The encounter between the Biblical message and Greek thought," the pope continues,

> did not happen by chance. . . . Biblical faith . . . encountered the best of Greek thought at a deep level, resulting in a mutual enrichment evident in the later wisdom literature. . . . A profound encounter of faith and reason is taking place there [in the Septuagint], an encounter between genuine enlightenment and religion. From the very heart of Christian faith, and, at the same time, the heart of Greek thought now joined to faith, Manuel II was able to say: "Not to act 'with logos' is contrary to God's nature.

> This means that Logos, far from being some cultural accretion, is part of the nature of God and, therefore, part of creation. The European, and by that term I include both North and South America and Australia, is traditionally born into a world that is radically reasonable, radically logical, because that world mirrors the mind of God, who behaves in ways that sometimes go beyond what human reason can comprehend but never in ways that contradict that reason.

So far so good. We agree wholeheartedly with what the Pope said about Logos, and we can see without too much effort that Islam has a radically different attitude toward the relationship between faith and reason. Europe has dealt with the threat for centuries, but from an historical perspective, the Islamic threat to Europe is only half the story.

At this point we come to the attack on Logos which is not mentioned in the Pope's speech, the Jewish attack on Logos, which manifests itself not by the threat of invasion from without, as is the case with Islam, which has sought to spread its faith by military conquest, but by the threat of subversion from within, otherwise known as revolution. If Muslims are alogos, because of Mohammed's imperfect understanding of the monotheistic traditions he absorbed from his position beyond the borders of a collapsing Greco-Roman civilization, then Jews are anti-Logos, in the sense that they reject Christ altogether. Islam did not reject Christ; Islam failed to understand Christ, as manifested in its rejection of both the Trinity and the Incarnation, and ended up trying to mask that misunderstanding by honoring Jesus as a prophet.

The situation with Jews is different. The Jews were God's chosen people. When Jesus arrived on earth as their long-awaited Messiah, the Jews, who, like all men, were given free will by God, had to make a decision. They had to either accept or reject the Christ, who was, so Christians believe, the physical embodiment of Logos.

As we will see, the Jews began by wanting to have the Messiah save them on their terms, which were suffused with racial pride. When the Jews tell Jesus in John 8 that they are the "seed of Abraham," in Greek "*sperma Abraam*," He changes the term of the argument by replying, "If you were Abraham's children, you would do as Abraham did," which is to say follow God's will and accept Jesus as the son of God and Messiah. Since the Jews, or those to whom Jesus is speaking, reject Jesus, they reject their father Abraham as well, and show that "the devil is [their] father."

Once Jesus arrives in Jerusalem, the term Jew in the Gospel of St. John is no longer a purely racial term. Jew has come to mean a rejecter of Christ. Race is no longer the focus. The Jews who accept Jesus will henceforth be known as Christians. The Jews who reject him are known henceforth as "Jews." As St. John reports in the Apocalypse, "Those who call themselves Jews" are really liars and members of the "synagogue of Satan" (Rev 2:9, 3:9).

By the middle of John's Gospel, the term Jew no longer has the clear racial meaning it had at the beginning when the Samaritan woman was told that "salvation is from the Jews." The other, more negative redefinition of the word Jew is also not essentially racial and becomes apparent in the story of the man born blind in John 9. That man's parents, we are told, refused to answer any questions about Jesus healing their son because they feared the "Jews." They "said this because they feared the Jews, for the Jews had already agreed that if any one should confess him to be Christ, he was to be put out of the synagogue." Clearly the split between "Jews" and followers of Christ had already begun.

The Jews rejected Christ because he was crucified. They wanted a powerful leader, not a suffering servant. Annas and Caiaphas mockingly told Christ that if he came down from the cross, they would accept him as the Messiah. When the Jews rejected Christ, they rejected Logos, and when they rejected Logos, which includes within itself the principles of social order, they became revolutionaries.

Jews may have become revolutionaries at the foot of the cross, but the full implications of their decision didn't become apparent until 30 years later, when the Jews rebelled against Rome, and Rome retaliated by destroying the Temple. At this point, the Jews had no temple, no priesthood, and no sacrifice, and as a result they had no way of fulfilling their covenant. Seeing which way the battle for Jerusalem was going, a rabbi, and deputy head of the Sanhedrin, by the name of Jochanan ben Zakkai had himself smuggled out of Jerusalem in a shroud, and, after being recognized by Roman authorities as a friend of Rome, was granted the privilege of founding a rabbinical school at Jabneh.

At this moment, some 30 years after the founding of the Church, modern Judaism, Judaism as we know it, was born as essentially a debating society, because in the absence of a Temple, that was all that Jews could do. The results of these interminable debates became known as the Talmud, which got written down over the next six centuries. The debating did nothing to eradicate the spirit of revolution from the Jewish mind, but in many ways intensified it by teaching the Jews to look for a military messiah.

The Jews got their military messiah roughly 60 years after the destruction of the Temple, when Simon bar Kokhba rose up against Rome in 131. The rabbis in Jerusalem, with a few exceptions, recognized bar Kokhba as the messiah, and so as if to prove that racial Judaism had become incoherent, the Christian Jews were expelled for not recognizing him as the messiah. It didn't matter whether your mother was Jewish; the ultimate determinant of Jewishness had become rejection of Christ, and that rejection led inexorably to revolution.

WHO AND WHAT IS A JEW? DEBATE OVER THE TERM

Debate over who the Jews are never ceases. Such debate comes up against a basic philosophical issue, something akin to the nominalism of William of Ockham. The issue revolves around the use of the word "Jew." Just what does the word refer to? Does it refer to anything at all, or is it like the word "tree," a word which, according to the nominalists, has no clear meaning, since in the real world the only thing which exists are individual birches, maples, etc? According to this unwritten rule of discourse, the term "Jew" refers to no category of beings in reality. Use of the term "Jew" as a category is, as a result, *ipso facto* evidence of anti-Semitism.

This reasoning is not a new phenomenon. Hilaire Belloc noticed it in England in the 1920s, when he wrote that if anyone "exposed a financial swindler who happened to be a Jew, he was an anti-Semite. If he exposed a group of Parliamentarians taking money from the Jews, he was an anti-Semite. If he did no more than call a Jew a Jew, he was an anti-Semite."[3]

Things have gotten worse since Belloc's time. Now it is impossible to write about Jews without opening oneself to the charge of anti-Semitism, as Belloc's current place in the literary firmament shows. It is impossible to refer to Belloc in polite circles without the mandatory disclaimer that he was an anti-Semite, partly because he wrote one book about the Jews. His views on Islam are much more censorious than his views on Jews, but that fact never gets mentioned. Nor is it obligatory to refer to Belloc as anti-Muslim.

If anything, what Belloc said then is *a fortiori* true today. Calling a Jew a Jew may or may not be *prima facie* evidence of anti-Semitism, but criticizing a group of people as Jews is regularly taken as such evidence. This is because it indicates that the group exists, that it has definable beliefs (at least in many contexts) and that it can, therefore, act in a certain way, and can even be criticized for so acting. All of this does not change the fact that the main task confronting anyone who decides to write about the Jews is to define precisely what he means by that term. It is precisely in the manipulation of the term "Jew" that its political benefits lie.

Since the term Jew actually gets used with some frequency, its use is determined by the political advantage of those who use it.[4] Thus, it is permissible in some circles to use the group designation when Jews are victims of some attack, but any reference to Jews as the perpetrators of some attack is, again, *ipso facto* evidence of anti-Semitism and also a sign of conspiracy mania as well. It's heads I win, tails you lose. So, again, according to another variation of the canons of contemporary discourse, it is permissible to say that Jews played a large role in the civil rights movement, but it would be anti-Semitic to say that they played a large role in the abortion rights movement.

Christians, however, must believe that there is a definite Jewish people who will perdure till the end of time. St Paul, addressing the Romans, says:

"If the root is holy so are the branches" (Romans 11.16). St. John Chrysostom, commenting on St. Paul's speech, explains that the root refers to Abraham and the patriarchs,

> from whom all the Jewish nation proceeded, as branches from that root: and . . . these *branches* are to be esteemed *holy*, not only because of the root they proceeded from, but also because they worshipped the true God. And if *some*, or a great many *of these branches*, have been *broken*, they may, as it is said (v.23) be ingrafted again. And you, Gentiles, ought to remember that, you were of yourselves *a wild-olive tree*: and it is only by the merciful call of God, that you have the happiness to *be ingrafted* upon the same root as the patriarchs; and so by imitating the faith of Abraham are become his spiritual children, and heirs of the promises, and by that means have been made partakers of *the root*. . . . And let me tell you, as to the Jews, if *they abide not still in unbelief*, God is able to ingraft them again into their own olive-tree: and it seems more easy, that they, who are naturally branches of the sweet olive-tree, should bring forth good fruit, when they shall be ingrafted in their own olive-tree, being of the race of Abraham, to whom the promises were made.[5]

THE TERM JEW DEFINED

The Christian then holds that the Jewish people have a perduring role and are at least in part defined by their refusal of the New Covenant and by their relationship to Abraham and his "seed." To discuss who counts as a Jew, it might be helpful to offer a working definition. We might say that there is a disjunctive positive component: A person who is related by birth or conversion to those similarly related by birth or conversion to Abraham[6]—and a negative component: A person who has not renounced Judaism by embracing another faith (especially Christianity).

The renowned Jewish scholar Jacob Neusner makes clear a distinction between Judaists and Jews, when he says: "The ethnic group does not define the religious system. . . . All Judaists—those who practice the religion, Judaism—are Jews, but not all Jews are Judaists. That is to say, all those who practice the religion, Judaism, by definition fall into the ethnic group, the Jews, but not all members of the ethnic group practice Judaism."[7]

However, Neusner adds, tellingly, that Christianity plays a special role in defining who counts as a Jew either ethnically or religiously: "The ethnic community opens its doors not by reason of outsiders' adopting the markers of ethnicity . . . but by reason of adopting what is not ethnic but religious. . . . While not all Jews practice Judaism, in the iron-clad consensus among contemporary Jews, Jews who practice Christianity cease to be part of the ethnic Jewish community, while those who practice Buddhism remain within."[8]

Without knowing it, Neusner is simply restating the thesis of this book: when Judaism rejected Christ it rejected Logos. In rejecting Christ, Judaism took on a negative identity, something that many Jews have realized at one time or another. The recent Jewish convert to Catholicism, Roy Schoeman, writes: "I remember praying, 'Let me know your name—I don't mind if you are Buddha, and I have to become a Buddhist; I don't mind if you are Apollo, and I have to become a Roman pagan; I don't mind if you are Krishna, and I have to become a Hindu; as long as you are not Christ and I have to become a Christian!'"[9] Schoeman presumably recognizes this perverse and deep-seated enmity to Logos as having come from a perversion of what was handed down by Moses.[10]

Such enmity to Logos as represented in the person of Jesus Christ is present in the Talmud. Princeton Jewish scholar Peter Schaefer notes that Talmudic stories mock claims of Jesus's birth from the Virgin Mary, challenge His claim to be the Messiah, and state that He was rightly executed for blasphemy and idolatry,[11] and that He resides in Hell, where His followers will go. Schaefer makes the startling claim that, rather than being ill-informed and ephemeral, parts of the Babylonian Talmud betray a remarkably high level of familiarity with the Gospels—especially Matthew and John—and represent a deliberate and sophisticated anti-Christian polemic.[12] And while many Jews may never read such passages there can be little doubt that they arose from the defining rejection of Christ by many Jews of His time, a rejection that finds echoes in present day attitudes to Christian converts from Judaism.

Ironically, the very Talmud that vilifies Christ appears to provide some evidence that He is the Messiah. The Talmud admits the central role of Jesus in salvation history in a number of significant, if indirect, ways. Roy Schoeman points out that to ensure that the Temple sacrifice had been successful in expiating the sins of the Jews, the priests and rabbis would watch to make sure that a scarlet thread had turned white. He cites the Talmudic verse from Rosh Hashanah 31b, "For forty years before the destruction of the Temple the thread of scarlet never turned white but it remained red." According to Schoeman, the Talmud itself "unwittingly confirms" that the Temple sacrifices failed 40 years before the destruction of the Temple in 70 AD (i.e., at the time when Christ died and the veil covering the Holy of Holies was rent in two) when it "recounts that from that time on . . . the scarlet thread never again turned white." According to the Talmud, the Temple was destroyed because therein prevailed "hatred without a cause." The Talmud might be said to be referring in some mysterious way to Christ's own words in John 15:18-25: "They hated me without a cause." The Talmud, in other words, "is exhibiting a gift of prophecy, stating a profound truth that unknowingly confirms Jesus' identity as the Messiah, although unaware of that fact."[13]

While the Talmud refers to the justice of Christ's execution, the Christian must believe that Christ died for our sins. According to the Catholic Church:

"'Sinners were the authors and the ministers of all the sufferings that the divine Redeemer endured.' Taking into account the fact that our sins affect Christ himself, the Church does not hesitate to impute to Christians the gravest responsibility for the torments inflicted upon Jesus, a responsibility with which they have all too often burdened the Jews alone." Moreover, the Catholic Catechism goes on to quote from an earlier Catechism: "We, however, profess to know him. And when we deny him by our deeds, we in some way seem to lay violent hands on him."[14]

It is all too easy to minimize this profound teaching, but in maximizing it we fall into another grave error by claiming that Jews were not primarily responsible *at the time and place* for bringing about the actual event in history that is known as the Crucifixion. Such a position directly contradicts the Gospel accounts and makes any understanding of the nature of the Jewish split impossible. After all, that famous Jewish convert St Peter (Acts 3.14-15) refers directly to those who killed Christ in addressing and appealing to the very people he saw as having done this. This rejection of Logos, rooted in an historical event, continues to play a part in what it means to be a Jew.

THE CHURCH'S TEACHING ON THE JEWS

In dealing with such complex and highly controversial matters it is important to be clear on what is not being said, as well as, what is. Clearly the Christian must hold certain views regarding the Jewish people, if only regarding their existence and continuance to the Second Coming as a people. Any individual Jew, like anyone else, can choose to follow Logos. He may follow the "lower logos" of the natural moral law—i.e., the law that St Paul tells us is written in the hearts of men. That law, fully understood, leads ultimately to Christ and the Church He founded. We might call the latter the Higher Logos. Deliberate rejection of Logos is deliberate rejection of salvation. A spirit founded on rejection of Logos can only lead to disaster. True, people may be more or less ignorant—for all sorts of reasons—of Logos. But there is a special tragedy if a member of the chosen people rejects what he or she was chosen for—as we see in the Gospels.

Anyone can choose to reject Logos—all of us do this or are tempted to reject the lower logos every day. But to have the rejection of the Higher Logos at the unavoidable core of one's religion, or even as a determining factor of who is to count as a member of one's community, means that a revolutionary spirit is entwined with that community.

By revolution we mean revolution against Logos—the deepest kind of revolution.[15] This Jewish revolutionary spirit is, as we have said, an internal (understood as above) enemy of Christianity. But so too are those Christian heresies that have, in one way or another attacked Christ, His Church, or the natural moral law. Part of the history to be recounted in this book is the story

of the relationship between the history of the Jews and the attacks on the Universal Church by Christian heretics linked to Jews or heavily influenced by Jews.

One example of such an alliance, typical of the history this volume is concerned with, is the Arian/Jewish alliance in the 4th century. St. John Henry Newman, in his work *The Arians of the Fourth Century*, makes the following observations:

> It is . . . a question, whether the mere performance of the rites of the Law, of which Christ came as anti-type and repealer, has not a tendency to withdraw the mind from the contemplation of the more glorious and real images of the Gospel; so that the Christians of Antioch would diminish their reverence towards the true Savior of man, in proportion as they trusted to the media of worship provided for a time by the Mosaic ritual. . . . In the Epistle addressed to them, the Judaizers are described as men laboring under an irrational fascination, fallen from grace, and self-excluded from the Christian privileges; when in appearance they were but using, what on the one hand might be called mere external forms, and on the other, had actually been delivered to the Jews on Divine authority. . . . If we turn to the history of the Church, we seem to see the evils in actual existence, which the Apostle anticipated in prophecy; that is, we see, that in the obsolete furniture of the Jewish ceremonial, there was in fact retained the pestilence of Jewish unbelief, tending (whether directly or not, at least eventually) to introduce fundamental error respecting the Person of Christ.[16]

Ultimately, the doctrinal issues are not the main issue. During the 4th century, the Jews sided with the Arians because they had become habituated to promoting revolution. In practical terms, John Henry Newman notes, "in the popular risings which took place in Antioch and Alexandria in favor of Arianism, the Jews sided with the heretical party, evincing thereby, not indeed any definite interest in the subject of dispute, but a sort of spontaneous feeling, that the side of heresy was their natural position; and further, that its spirit, and the character which it created, were congenial to their own."[17]

This book records how such a "spontaneous feeling" has played itself out in history, in a conflict between Judaism, Jewish movements, heresies and the Catholic Church.

Rabbi Louis Israel Newman[18] points out how Jews have consistently supported revolutionary movements throughout history. Jews joined forces with heretics during the Albigensian crisis, the Hussite revolution, the Reformation, and at the birth of modern England. They joined forces with revolutionaries during The Enlightenment, the Russian Revolution and the Civil Rights movement. We also see the conflict between the Church and Judaism working itself out at the birth of the Spanish Inquisition, the spread

of the Polish empire and the Chmielnicki rebellion that began the break-up of that empire. Finally, we see a Jewish presence in the rise of the American Empire.

As always, movements are led by the few—a few often unrepresentative of the many. The evolutionary psychologist Kevin MacDonald, in examining Jewish movements, has suggested the following approach to the issue—that a Jewish movement is a movement dominated by Jews "with no implication that all or most Jews are involved in these movements and restrictions on what the movements are," and that one must "determine whether the Jewish participants in those movements identified as Jews *and* thought of their involvement in the movement as advancing specific Jewish interests." He adds that involvement may be unconscious or involve self-deception, but in many of the cases he examines, it is more straightforward.[19] A revolutionary movement may be led by religious or non-religious Jews and still count as a Jewish revolutionary movement.[20]

The Catholic response to the revolutionary Jewish rejection of Logos came to be known as "*Sicut Judaeis non . . .*" a doctrine codified by Pope Gregory the Great and reiterated by virtually every pope after him. According to "*Sicut Judaeis non. . .*" no one has the right to harm Jews or disrupt their worship services, but the Jews have, likewise, no right to corrupt the faith or morals of Christians or subvert Christian societies.

Since the time of Gregory the Great, the Church has applied "*Sicut Judaeis non. . .*" even at the risk of appearing "anti-Semitic," a charge which has become more frequent in modern times. A classic instance of "modern" alleged anti-Semitism is the pastoral letter on morals issued in 1936 by Augustine Cardinal Hlond, the primate of Poland.[21] But it invariably is quoted selectively as proof of Hlond's anti-Semitism. Read in full, Hlond's pastoral letter is instead a classic application of "*Sicut Judaeis non. . .*," as I demonstrate at length in volume two. Cardinal Hlond did not express racial hatred; he instead warned his Polish flock about the dangers of Bolshevism, which was an essentially Jewish movement. He opposed Jewish revolutionary activity, but he also opposed the vicious reaction to it known as Nazism, which had taken over Germany. The Church consistently opposed revolution but also defended the Jews against genuine persecution. Both parts of this teaching are necessary. If either is ignored, trouble follows.

Cardinal Hlond was not expressing racial hatred here; he was warning his Polish flock about the dangers of Bolshevism, which, as all of Europe had learned during the 1920s, was an essentially Jewish movement. Cardinal Hlond was opposing Jewish revolutionary activity on the one hand, but he was also opposing the vicious reaction to Jewish revolutionary activity that was known as Nazism, which had taken over Germany at that time. The Church was consistent in its opposition to revolution on the one hand, and

in defending the Jews against genuine persecution on the other. Both parts of this teaching are necessary. If either one is ignored, trouble follows.

This, of course, is precisely what happened in the wake of the Second Vatican Council. *Nostra Aetate*, the council document on non-Christian religions, was supposed to usher in a new era of interfaith dialogue, with Jews in particular. What followed can best be gleaned from a sampling of statements issued both around the time of, or as part of, what claimed to be a celebration of the document's 40th anniversary. In his book *A Moral Reckoning: the Role of the Catholic Church in the Holocaust and its Unfulfilled Duty of Repair*, Daniel Jonah Goldhagen wrote, "For centuries the Catholic Church . . . harbored anti-Semitism at its core, as an integral part of its doctrine, its theology and its liturgy."[22] As his contribution to a "celebration" of 40 years of *Nostra Aetate*, Yona Metzger, Israel's chief rabbi, wrote in the Jesuit magazine *America* that in *Nostra Aetate*, the Church rejected "the normative view of Jews that had been held throughout Christendom for many centuries" namely, that "the Jews rejected Christ and were guilty of the crime of deicide; consequently, they had been rejected by the Creator in favor of the Christians," who were "the new Israel." Rabbi Metzger went on to say that this attitude of "supercessionism," and "the teaching of contempt," "laid the groundwork for centuries of discrimination, persecution and violence against Jews, culminating in the Shoah, in which one-third of Jewry was murdered."[23]

This book then is the story of those movements that embody a spirit of rebellion (conscious or unconscious) against Logos, which more often than not meant an attack on Christ and His Church through history. This spirit is embodied not just in Judaism but in numerous Christian heresies and secular movements.

The Good Friday prayers of the Catholic Church reach out to those affected with such a spirit. The 1962 Good Friday prayer for the Jews reads:

> Let us pray also for the Jews that the Lord our God may take the veil from their hearts and that they also may acknowledge our Lord Jesus Christ. Let us pray: Almighty and everlasting God, you do not refuse your mercy even to the Jews; hear the prayers which we offer for the blindness of that people so that they may acknowledge the light of your truth, which is Christ, and be delivered from their darkness.

The Church had amended the prayer from an earlier version referring to "perfidious" or "faithless" Jews. Since that time it has been further amended, even to the point of ambiguity. However, with Pope Benedict XVI's recent *Summorum Pontificum* motu proprio, the 1962 prayer will be more commonly heard. The prayer now reads as follows: "Let us pray for the Jews. That our God and Lord may enlighten their hearts, so that they may recognize Jesus Christ, the Savior of all men. Let us pray. Let us bend our knees. Rise. Almighty and eternal God, who wants all of mankind to be saved and gain knowledge of the

truth, grant that when the fullness of peoples enters your Church all of Israel may be saved. Through Christ, our Lord." Far from being "anti-Semitic" it is, as the Jewish atheist Israel Shahak noted, "a prayer which asked the Lord to have mercy on Jews. . ."[24]

The rewriting of the 1962 prayer in a way that retains the orginal explicit call for conversion is a sign that the post-Vatican II era is drawing to a close. Nowhere is the need for closure and re-evaluation more urgent than in the Church's teaching on the Jews. Although *Nostra Aetate* was supposed to inaugurate a new era of interfaith dialogue, it instead led to a condemnation of the heart of the Gospel's call for conversion as "supercessionism," and confusion in the face of an increasingly imperious foreign policy under the leadership of what is now called the "Israel Lobby." By the time Daniel Jonah Goldhagen's attack on Pius XII appeared the 40 years of interfaith dialogue inaugurated by *Nostra Aetate* had resulted in apparent heresy on the part of leading Church authorities, diatribes on the part of Jews, and political disaster for the entire world. When the Church acquiesced to the Jewish interpretation of *Nostra Aetate*, she opened the door to the rise of neoconservative foreign policy in the United States, which led to the disastrous war in Iraq. Dialogue in this context has reached a dead end on both theological and political levels. It is my hope that this book will promote a rethinking of these issues and a return to the wisdom of tradition.

No book of this size can come into existence without help. I would like to acknowledge James G. Bruen, Anthony S. McCarthy, Jeffrey J. Langan and John Beaumont for the assistance they provided in bringing this book out.

E. Michael Jones
South Bend, Indiana
December 2007

Chapter One

The Synagogue of Satan

Sensing that Hellenistic hegemony over Palestine had run its course, Pompey played off the descendants of Alexander the Great's generals against each other as a prelude to seizing power and completing the ring of Roman rule around the Mediterranean, the ocean the Romans called "ours." In 64 BC Pompey deposed Philip II, the last Seleucid, and made Syria a Roman province. Pompey soon learned the Jews would not be incorporated into the empire without a struggle, just as his successors found they could not keep the Jews in the empire without bitter struggles.

One year after taking Syria without firing a shot, so to speak, Pompey was enmired in a siege of Jerusalem. He called for battering rams from Tyre and had trees felled to cross the moats surrounding the city walls, but success was uncertain. The Jews had water and food; they also had the Temple to their god, about which Pompey had heard impressive if contradictory reports. While Pompey sat outside the walls, the priests sacrificed to their god, who seemed disposed to hold the Romans at bay.

So Pompey studied the Jewish religion. The Jewish prohibition against work on the Sabbath allowed bearing arms only to defend against attack. The Roman soldiers therefore laid down their arms on the Jewish Sabbath and instead undermined the city's walls, against which Jewish religious scruple allowed no action.

In June 63 BC one Temple tower fell. Roman soldiers poured through the breach into the Temple precincts where they slaughtered the Jewish priests. Many Jews committed suicide by throwing themselves off the Temple battlements. Others immolated themselves on pyres intended for sacrificial animals. All in all, 12,000 Jews died. With victory imminent, Pompey's curiosity about the inner sanctum of the Jewish Temple replaced the concerns of war. Wading through the blood of slain priests, Pompey penetrated to the holy of holies to find that the object of Jewish worship was not an ass's head, as Alexandrian propagandists had claimed. He discovered that, in Roman terms, there was no object of worship. Perhaps Pompey found the empty shrine unsettling; perhaps he was disconcerted by a presence he felt even

though no object represented it. Either way, Pompey halted before the Temple treasury with its gold and retreated empty-handed.

The Temple was left standing, but the walls of Jerusalem were razed. A tax was levied against the Jews in amounts appropriate to a conquered province. The Temple had been violated, but it remained intact. Temple sacrifices continued, but Israel ceased to exist as a nation with a state.

Pompey executed the most fanatical Jewish revolutionaries, the Zealots. He named the pliable, dim-witted Hyrcanus high-priest and ethnarch, ensuring he was only a figurehead by putting him under the authority of Antipater, whom he made governor of Judaea. The more formidable Aristobulus was sent to Rome with his son Antigonus and a horde of Jewish prisoners, whose descendants, known as *libertini*, or the emancipated, settled on the right bank of the Tiber on the slopes of the Vatican hill. The bridge across the Tiber was known as the *Pons Judaeorum,* indicating the race of the settlers, and that they had been there for a long time.

Defeat led to Jewish dispersion. From that dispersed seemingly hopeless position, the descendants of the Jews began to wage, in Graetz's words, "a new kind of warfare against long-established Roman institutions" which would ultimately "modify or partly destroy them."[1] Graetz is referring to Christianity—the most successful Jewish sect, in his view. To conquer Rome from within, Judaism had to be modified, however, and it "became estranged from and placed itself in harsh antagonism to the parent source."[2] But Graetz could have referred to other Jewish sects that were not estranged because, while they were swallowed by the Roman empire, they refused to be digested by it. As Roman oppression increased, Jewish settlements across the empire became the source of insurrection and revolutionary activity that would threaten the existence of the empire in a different way from the ultimately successful Christian threat.

The Romans were generally adept at ruling conquered nations, but Roman rule in Palestine was a story of blunders and oppression. Because the Maccabees had thrown off Greek hegemony 100 years before Pompey's triumph, a similar victory against the Romans didn't seem impossible. The defeat of the Jews by yet another foreign power, together with the arrogance and blunders of the Romans thus fueled apocalyptic fervor among the Jews.

Apocalyptic literature started under the Hellenistic hegemony due to Alexander the Great's conquests in 333 BC. Antiochus IV Epiphanes pressed assimilation in 167 BC by abolishing Jewish practices and establishing the cult of Zeus in the Temple. He ordered pagan sacrifice on the new altar of the Temple. The priest Mattathias and his five sons called upon the Jews to revolt. Three years of war followed, during which the Book of Daniel was written. Daniel is the first in a series of Apocalypses, or revelations of things hidden, that culminate in the book of Revelation, which completes the canon of Christian scripture. Apocalyptic writing enjoyed its greatest popularity

from 200 BC to 100 AD, a time of distress and persecution for Jews and then for Christians. Daniel, according to the editors of the New American Bible, "was composed during the bitter persecution carried on by Antiochus IV Epiphanes (167-164) and was written to strengthen and comfort the Jewish people in their ordeal" by showing "that men of faith can resist temptation and conquer adversity."[3]

In the second chapter of Daniel, King Nebuchadnezzar dreams of a statue with feet of clay, which none of his sages can interpret. Daniel explains the four parts of the statue correspond to four kingdoms which will rule the earth. The fourth kingdom "will crush and break all of the earlier kingdoms" in a sequence of events familiar to the inhabitants of Palestine. But the fourth kingdom under the dominion of the fourth beast "shall devour" as well "the whole earth, beat it down and crush it." The Book of Daniel is describing the trajectory of human history in a fallen world. One empire follows the other; the only constant: oppression, with each successive kingdom more tyrannical than the previous one.

The Book of Daniel also proposes an "end to history." "A stone broke away, untouched by any hand, and struck the statue, struck its feet of iron and earthenware and shattered them." According to Daniel's interpretation: "In the time of these kings the God of heaven will set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed, and this kingdom will not pass into the hands of another race; it will shatter and absorb all the previous kingdoms and itself last for ever—just as you saw the stone untouched by hand break from the mountain and shatter iron, bronze, earthenware, silver and gold."

After the triumph of the worst and most oppressive fourth kingdom, Daniel has another vision in which "I saw One like a son of man coming on the clouds of heaven." The "son of man" is the messianic designation; the Messiah will establish dominion unlike any other. "His dominion is an everlasting dominion that shall not be taken away; his kingship shall not be destroyed." The divided lower part of the statue—half clay and half iron—probably refers to the failed merger of the Seleucids and the Ptolemies, Alexander the Great's successors who failed to keep his legacy of conquest unified. The fourth kingdom is traditionally taken as Rome, but that can be ascribed only to prophecy or hindsight.

Pompey did what Daniel said the fourth beast would do: he conquered Jerusalem in 63 BC. He crushed the kingdom of clay and iron, but his victory only intensified the messianic expectation. The triumph of the fourth kingdom indicated that the Messiah's coming was imminent. The Son of Man was to deliver the Jews from foreign oppression and inaugurate an unending kingdom that would break apart all empires. Oppression fueled messianic fervor. The Messiah "became more superhuman as the situation became more hopeless."[4] The Messiah became for the oppressed Jewish people "a mighty warrior" to destroy Israel's foes and "take captive the leader of the Romans

and bring him in chains to Mount Zion, where he will put him to death" and "establish a kingdom which shall last to the end of the world." Deliverance from political oppression would occur in the only manner the Jewish people considered possible—through a mighty general who "would show himself invincible in war." As the conflict with Rome became bitterer, "messianic fantasies became with many Jews an obsessive preoccupation."[5]

From the Christian perspective, the apocalyptic age culminated in Christ. Jesus, repeatedly referring to himself as "the Son of Man," was invoking the prophecy in Daniel and pointing to himself as the inaugurator of the messianic Kingdom. As his earthly life became more public, it became clear that Jesus was no mighty warrior of the sort the Jews admired in King David. He claimed to be of the House of David, but it was unclear how a man who was not a warrior was going to bring freedom to captives held in bondage by Roman arms.

The Jewish desire for a "superhuman" savior found fulfillment and disappointment in Jesus Christ. Christ convinced his followers He was superhuman, but he disabused them of the notion He was merely a more powerful version of David or Alexander the Great or Caesar. "Superman" is a comic book figure created in America during the Depression by Jerry Siegel and Joe Schuster, Jews of eastern European extraction who couldn't expunge the idea of a messiah from their consciousness.[6] But it also bespeaks a perennial inability to see supernature as anything more than a comic exaggeration of the military heroes who conquered the Jews.

The Superman fantasy has plagued the Jews since the time of Christ. Was the Son of Man the same as Superman? Was the Kingdom of God a more powerful version of Rome? How would the Messiah overthrow Rome? How would the stone untouched by human hands shatter the fourth kingdom? No one had the answers because, ultimately, the ambiguity could only be cleared up by the Messiah, the Son of Man, Himself. Arrival of the kingdom is a central theme of the synoptic gospels, and Jesus, in calling himself "the Son of Man" reminds us he fulfills the destiny of this mysterious figure. Jesus identified himself as the "Son of Man," but his encounters with his fellow Jews showed their difficulty in distinguishing between the "Son of Man" and a fantasy Superman.

Graetz claims "the rapacity of the Roman rulers" intensified "the longing for the deliverer announced in the prophetical writings" so much that "any highly gifted individual. . . would have readily found disciples and believers in his messianic mission."[7] That would have come as a surprise to Jesus. The Gospel of John describes Jesus in increasingly acrimonious debate with "the lost sheep of the House of Israel," the very people he came to save, who, according to Graetz, were willing to accept "any highly gifted individual" as their messiah. The Jews' longing for release from Roman oppression increased with each year, but it fixated on a figure who wielded military power. The Nazarean was

proposing something else, and the conflict with Jewish expectations led to increasingly bitter heated discussions and recriminations until the Jews who rejected Jesus finally sought his death.

The first coming of Christ created a crisis for the Jews. In the Gospels, the Jews define themselves by their relationship to the man who claims to be the "Son of Man" or the Messiah. As a result, the discussion of messianic expectations becomes very quickly a discussion of what it means to be a Jew. Klaus Wengst says that "the Gospel of John was written out of the situation of a hard-pressed Jewish Christian minority which found itself in the period following 70 AD confronted by the opposition of rabbinical orthodoxy."[8]

Whether the Gospel of St. John was written after the destruction of the Temple, as Wengst maintains, or before, as Markus Barth maintains, Roman hegemony created the political context for both groups of Jews, for "those who rejected Christ and for the Jews and non-Jews who believed in him as the Messiah."[9]

The conflict between these two groups of Jews pervades the Gospel of St. John. That gospel, in which the term "Jew" appears 71 times, is a protracted discussion of what it means to be a Jew. Who are "the Jews"? Well, it depends; the word has different meanings in different contexts, but the context gets increasingly specific and increasingly hostile as the Gospel narrative progresses, leading ultimately to a break between "the Jews" and Jesus that leads to His death.

One of the most interesting consequences of the Anti-Defamation League's attack on Mel Gibson's *The Passion* was the focus on whether the gospels are anti-Semitic. Abraham Foxman and Rabbi James Rudin condemned the film because it contained the passage from Matthew 27:25 when the Jewish people shout to Pilate, "His blood be on us and our children." But, if the statement is anti-Semitic, then the fault lies not with Mel Gibson but with St. Matthew. By thus framing the issue, Foxman and Rudin reveal their real position, namely, that the Gospels and by extension Christianity are intrinsically anti-Semitic; Mel Gibson needs to be censured because he makes the statement publicly, i.e., in a big budget film. Rabbi Daniel Lapin was appalled at Foxman and Rudin, "self-appointed Jewish leaders," for making a spectacle of themselves and harming the standing of all Jews in the United States, but Foxman and Rudin did frame the issue honestly from a specifically Jewish perspective by implying that the Gospels are anti-Semitic.

Philip S. Kaufman, a Christian Jew and Benedictine priest, tries to restore civility by insisting the Gospel of St. John is the least anti-Semitic (by which he means anti-Jewish) Gospel. Kaufman bases his argument on comparison of the Passion narratives, but he glosses over Chapter 8 of the Gospel of St. John, especially 8:44 where Jesus tells the "Jews" that "the devil is your father," a passage Caron calls the most anti-Semitic New Testament passage.[10] Trying

to be irenic, Kaufman argues for translation of the Johannine phrase "*hoi Iudaioi*" as "the Jerusalem officials, leaders or authorities."[11]

Kaufman would probably find a sympathetic ear in Rabbi Lapin. Rabbi Lapin, however, is the exception that proves the rule. Jewish leaders would not be leaders if they didn't have followers, and their followers continue to be unimpressed by Catholic ecumenical outreach. The unavoidable issue is the intrinsically anti-Jewish nature of the Christian scriptures. Indeed, the disappointment is so universal since the time of *Nostra Aetate*, the Vatican II statement on non-Christian religions, that re-evaluation and course correction seem unavoidable.

At an Evangelical-Jewish dialogue at the Evangelical Academy of Arnoldshain in Germany in March 1989, Micha Brumlik, a Jewish participant, got quickly to the point. How is dialogue possible when the "irreducible Kernel" of the Gospel of St. John is "intrinsically anti-Jewish"?[12] If that Gospel is, as Brumlik claims, "an embassy of hate," then the issue is not inter-faith dialogue but the identity of Christianity itself. If the Gospel of St. John is normative for Christianity, then Christianity is a religion of hate, and there is no point in engaging in dialogue with its adherents. Brumlik engages in the dialogue, but only to denounce the foundational writings of Christianity as hate speech. In the Gospel of St. John, he writes,

> the message that is supposed to lead the people by way of faith and the Son to the Father, is in reality a message of maginalization, fear, anxiety and hate. There is no other scripture in the New Testament in which Christianity more fully achieves its non-Jewish identity, and there is no other scripture in which the marginalization of the Jews, and by that I mean Judaism, is achieved in such a sharp, irreconcilable and unbridgeable manner as in the Gospel according to John.[13]

St. John achieves this by portraying Jews "both in the form of the spontaneous Mob as well as in the form of the political religious leadership" as "murderers, assassins and killers." Even the Jews who believed in Jesus, "insofar as they wanted to remain Jews," have to hear themselves denounced as "children of the Devil."[14]

The heart of the matter for Brumlik lies in Chapter 8, which he sees as "proto-racist" and manifesting "politically and socio-psychologically explainable delusions" tied together in a "consistent Satanology" demonizing the Jews and giving them "no chance."[15] According to Brumlik, St. John portrays the Jews

> as a group of people, who don't recognize Jesus as the Son of God because they are ontologically and constitutionally incapable of recognizing him as such. This is part and parcel, according to this view, of the satanic nature of the Jews. They can't recognize him and so they must persecute him: "Why don't you understand what I am saying? Because you can't

> hear my word. The Devil is your father, and you prefer to do what your father wants. He was a murderer from the start and was never grounded in the truth; there is no truth in him at all."[16]

The Gospels are not and cannot be construed as anti-Semitic, because, as Caron points out in *Qui son les "Juifs" de l'evangile de Jean?* "It is clear that the expression does not include the entirety of the Jewish people. Jesus and his disciples, along with John the Baptist, are Jews."[17] The term "Jew," according to Caron, "is not used in an ethnic or racial sense."[18] The Gospels cannot be anti-Semitic because the antagonists are all Semites. The Gospels do not espouse hatred of individuals because of race; it would be impossible for them to do so because the Christians in the Gospels are all Jews. This does not preclude, however, the "anti-Jewish" nature of the Gospels, depending on how one defines the term.

How is the term "Jew" used? Brumlik is not helpful here. He's unable to clarify the issue because clarification revolves around the true identity of Christ. The Gospel of St. John, according to Brumlik, portrays "Jews, in fact all Jews, insofar as they are Jews—which is to say, insofar as they hold fast to their position as children of Abraham—as essentially damned enemies of Jesus."[19] Jesus would probably object, not because damnation was not a real possibility for his opponents (see Matthew 23:15, 23:33)—but because Brumlik portrays them as loyal children of Abraham, a contention Jesus rejects in John 8:37: "If you were Abraham's children, you would do as Abraham did."

The Gospel of St. John is not and cannot be construed as anti-Semitic, but is it, as Brumlik claims, "*judenfeindlich*"?[20] Is it anti-Jewish? Following scripture scholar Raymond Brown's lead, Kaufman avoids the issue, claiming that by "hoi Iudaioi," St. John means "Jewish leaders." "To capture its correct meaning," Kaufman writes, "*tous Ioudaious* and *hoi Iudaioi* could be translated in the same verse as 'the Jerusalem officials, leaders or authorities.'"[21] Kaufman says "the tendency in the past to fuel anti-Semitism by that Gospel's frequent use of the phrase 'the Jews,'" could "be eliminated by the translation of *hoi Iudaioi* as 'hostile Jerusalem leaders,' where that translation is justified in the context."[22] Kaufman gripes that several new translations of the Bible eliminated sexist language but "did not at the same time correct 'anti-Jewish' language." Unless better translations are made, "such corrections should be made in lectionaries and all materials used for pubic reading and study."[23]

Translating "*hoi Iudaioi*" as "the Jewish leaders" creates its own problems. Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimethea were Jewish leaders, but they were also followers of Christ and thus proof there was as little unanimity among leaders as among followers. Brumlik rightly rejects translation of *hoi Iudaioi* as "leaders" because that would hide what John makes clear, namely, "that he's talking not just about the Pharisees but about all Jews. . . ."[24] At the beginning

of the Gospel of St. John *hoi Iudaioi* means all of the Jews; by the end of that Gospel it means all of the Jews who have rejected Christ.

The Jews aren't Judeans or Pharisees or other groups opposing the followers of Jesus; they are, in Brumlik's view, the Jewish people.[25] The fact that the "divine Word" of the Christians was a Jew doesn't change the fundamentally anti-Jewish nature of this gospel.[26] Brumlik concludes that dialogue between Christians and Jews is impossible if either takes the Gospel of St. John as its starting point.[27] There is no possible meeting point because Jesus is the essence of Christianity, according to this gospel, and that essence is "precisely what Jews, *insofar as they want to remain Jews*, must reject."[28]

Brumlik inadvertently makes the same point as St. John. To hold onto their "identity," the "Jews" had to reject Christ. The "Jews" (as opposed to the entire ethnic group, some of which accepted Christ as the Messiah) created a new identity for themselves, one that is essentially negative.

St. John brings readers to this understanding gradually as the Jews define themselves in encounters with Christ in his gospel. Jew, in the context of the Gospel of St. John, cannot mean all Jews in an ethnic or racial sense, since Jesus himself was a Jew, as were his disciples. Caron says, "this particular use of 'hoi Iudaioi' in the narrative context of the gospel denies us the possibility of using the expression in any nationalist or ethnic sense."[29] Similarly, Caron denies "*hoi Iudaioi*" can be translated as "Jewish leaders."

What does St. John mean when he refers to "the Jews"? When St. John uses the words "*hoi Iudaioi*," he is referring to a group that has rejected Christ. The coming of Christ changed Jewish identity forever, something the Jews at His time comprehended only with difficulty. From then, the terms "Israelite" and "Jew" were no longer synonyms, because, Ferdinand Hahn points out in Caron's book, "the 'true Israelites'" from the Christian perspective "are precisely those who, like Nathaniel, recognize in Jesus the Messiah."[30]

The conflict that defines "Jew" in the fourth gospel is essentially religious.[31] Caron suggests that when St. John employs "*hoi Iudaioi*" he means "Judaism." But what does Judaism mean? Both terms are defined in John's narratives. The Jews define themselves and their religion in light of Jesus proclaiming himself the Messiah. Caron notes the dialogue with the Jews invariably occurs during a religious festival when Jesus is either in or on his way to Jerusalem. "It is not coincidence," he writes, "that the confrontation with Jesus takes place precisely on the occasion of those celebrations." Judaism celebrates the "Jews'" identity, their origins, their history and their past, and anyone who questions one of these elements, as Jesus does, is a threat to that identity.[32] The festivals celebrate and confirm Jewish identity; the encounters between Jesus and the "Jews" occur during the festivals because for John Jewish identity revolves around the person of Jesus.

Christianity is intimately connected with Christ. Judaism is just as intimately connected with Jerusalem. The "Judaism in question takes on an

official character. It has its seat in Jerusalem and it is hostile to Jesus."[33] It is "*le principal accusatueur*" of Jesus.[34] Its headquarters is in Jerusalem where all confrontations between Christ and "the Jews" occur; it is the center of the "systematic hostility of 'Judaism'" against Jesus.

St. John mentions this systematic hostility in describing the man born blind but healed by Jesus. Word of the miracle spread, but "*the Jews* [my emphasis] would not believe that the man had been blind and had gained his sight." To confirm (or discredit) the story, the "Jews" sent for the man's parents (who, like the man, were Jewish), who were intimidated, refusing to speak "out of fear of the Jews, who had already agreed to expel from the synagogue anyone who should acknowledge Jesus as the Christ."

Brumlik claims there is no evidence of intra-Jewish dissension outside of the gospel accounts, but there is plenty within them. Some commentators claim this bespeaks a projection backward in time from the time of the writing of the gospel, which some place as late as 170 AD. The testimony of John, who says he was an eyewitness whose "testimony is true," is that the split was virtually contemporaneous with the public ministry of Jesus. It is difficult to see how it could be otherwise. The claim that Jesus was the "Son of Man" required a decision by the Jews. In John 7:11, we read that "At the festival the Jews were on the look-out for him: 'Where is he?' they said. People stood in groups whispering about him. Some said, 'He is a good man'; others 'No, he is leading the people astray.' Yet no one spoke about him openly for fear of the Jews."

The meaning of "Jew" in this context is clear: a "Jew" is openly hostile to Christ and willing to persecute those Jews who accept Him as the Messiah. John's mention of "fear of the Jews" indicates that Jews were then afraid of "Jews." The well-being of the Jews who accepted Christ was threatened by the Jews who rejected him. The parents of the man born blind exhibit "fear of the Jews" because the "Jews" threaten to expel followers of Jesus, also Jews, from the synagogue. The identity of both groups was essentially religious, not ethnic; both identities were a function of Christ. The Jews who acknowledged Christ were expelled from the synagogue. The Jews who rejected Him, the people John calls "the Jews," defined themselves by that rejection.

Unsatisfied by the parents' evasions, the "Jews sent for the man" to question him themselves. They ask him leading questions and tell him to "Give glory to God!" by testifying against Jesus, because "For our part, we know that this man is a sinner." The man refuses to be intimidated by "the Jews." "I only know," he responds, "that I was blind and now I can see." When "the Jews" want him to repeat his story, presumably to catch him in contradictions, the man refuses: "I have told you once and you wouldn't listen. Why do you want to hear it all again? Do you want to become his disciples too?" This outrages "the Jews," who respond indignantly "we are disciples of Moses."

At another point, Jesus rejects their claim to be disciples of Moses. In John 5:45, Jesus tells the "Jews":

> Do not imagine that I am going to accuse you before the Father:
> You place your hopes on Moses,
> and Moses will be your accuser.
> If you really believed him,
> you would believe me too,
> since it was I that he was writing about;
> but if you refuse to believe what he wrote,
> how can you believe what I say?

The arrival of Jesus, according to St. John, is the defining moment for all Jews. He brings a radical discontinuity in history too, for those who claim to be followers of Moses are not what they claim to be. They are, in fact, the opposite: in rejecting Christ they reject Moses and everything Moses stood for. The term "law," usually used in the same context as Moses, the lawgiver, is also deceptive. Jesus refuses to admit that "the Jews" are true to the law of Moses. Instead, he refers repeatedly to "the Jews" as following "their law" or "your law." As Caron says, "The term 'law' does not refer in this case to the law of Moses or to the writings of Moses, but rather to the law of the 'Jews' or that of the pharisees. . . . The Jews are not faithful to the former but rather to their own law, or put another way, to a false interpretation of the law of Moses."[35] The official Judaism of Jerusalem thus is not what it pretends to be. Judaism is not Judaism at all but rather what Caron calls "*un pseudo-Judaisme.*"[36] The "Jews" are faithful to "their law," not the law of Moses.

What is true about Moses *vis a vis* the "Jews" who claim him as their father is also *a fortiori* true about Abraham. As the discussion of spiritual parentage moves from chapter 5 to chapter 8, the terms become more intimate. Instead of talking about the law, the "Jews" talk about "*sperma*" or the biological inheritance of their status as the chosen people. In both cases there is a radical discontinuity in history. Or, to put it another way, the continuity is not what it seems. Those who accept Christ are the children of Abraham and Moses. Those who call themselves "Jews" are liars.

St. John was a Jew. More precisely, St. John was a Jew but not "a Jew." According to Overbeck: "the author of the fourth gospel" is "not a pagan Christian. . . he is instead a hellenistic Jew."[37] Why, then, does St. John refer to the "Jews" as an alien "they," determined to kill Christ? The answer again revolves around how the meaning of the word evolves in the Gospel. John begins by describing Jesus' encounter with the Samaritan woman. Jesus tells the woman

> You worship what you do not know;
> we worship what we do know;

This dichotomy is simple. Jesus is a Jew; the Samaritan woman is not. The distinction is important because, as Jesus says, "Salvation comes from the Jews." His declaration seems straight-forward; the Jews are an ethnic group that is God's chosen people. From this group, salvation will come. Then, as if to complicate things, Jesus adds

> the hour will come—is in fact already here—
> when true worshippers will worship the Father in spirit and truth.

Now that Jesus has arrived, the categories "Jew" and "true worshippers" are no longer synonymous. Salvation comes from the Jews, i.e, from an ethnic group that calls itself the chosen people. Upon Christ's arrival, however, the situation changes, for the Jews have to accept Christ to remain Israel. The Jews have to accept Christ to become "true worshippers" who "will worship the Father in spirit and truth."

The full implication of his cryptic message to the Samaritan woman only becomes apparent, however, when Jesus confronts the Jews, and in this confrontation the meaning of the word "Jew" also becomes apparent. John uses the term "Jew" two ways. He begins by saying that "Salvation comes from the Jews," and ends by saying those who call themselves "Jews" are not children of Abraham or Moses and, in fact, have Satan as their father. From identifying the word Jew with "we," as he does with the Samaritan woman, Jesus goes on to refer to what John calls "Jews" as "you," which is to say, a group that does not include Jesus. Accepting or rejecting the Messiah becomes the principal way of defining what it means to be a Jew.

John makes this clear in chapter 8. The discussion becomes progressively more heated, leading to an irreparable break between Jesus and "the Jews." When Jesus says to "them," i.e., "the Jews,"

> "I am going away; you will look for me
> and you will die in your sin.
> Where I am going you cannot come."

The Jews become confused, wondering "Will he kill himself?" But Jesus indicates that a great division already exists. The "Jews" can no longer be referred to as a "we" that includes Jesus, but rather as "you," i.e., as a group that does not include Christ because it rejected him. "You," Christ continues, referring to "the Jews,"

> are from below;
> I am from above.
> You are of this world;
> I am not of this world.

The issue of what it means to be a "Jew" thus can only be resolved by resolving the issue of Christ's identity. Christ is the antithesis of sin. Those who reject Christ will die in their sins. "I have told you already," Christ tells

"the Jews," "You will die in your sins." The "Jews" redefined themselves by rejecting Christ as the Messiah. They proposed false dichotomies—Moses vs. Jesus; Abraham vs. Jesus—which became nonetheless the essential defining characteristic of what it meant to be a "Jew." Thus, the term "Jew" is slowly redefined throughout the Gospel of St. John, until by the end of the Gospel it means something different from what it meant at the beginning. This new meaning necessitates the awkward use of quotation marks when the term "Jew" is used. With Christ's arrival and the annunciation of his ministry as "the Son of Man," the term "Jew" has either a completely and exclusively ethnic meaning, i.e., one shorn of any notion of chosenness, or it has a completely and exclusively theological meaning: A "Jew" is someone who rejects Christ and as a result will die in his sins. After the Jews rejected Christ, Judaism ceased being a religion and became an ideology. Or, to say the same thing another way, it went from being a true religion (in fact, the only true religion) to being a false religion, like Islam, Mormonism, Scientology, etc., in spite of the fact that it still claimed the inspired word of God as its fondational texts. Israel simultaneously lost its biological basis. The New Israel, the true children of Moses and Abraham, was now the Church.

The Jews, aware of the redefinition of their identity, are not happy and try to return the discussion to their role as the chosen people or the ethnic group favored by God. The Jews respond to Jesus' denunciation by saying, "We are descended from Abraham." The Greek is instructive, for the Jews say to Jesus "*Sperma Abraam esmen,*" that is, "we are the sperm of Abraham," or we share Abraham's DNA and are in exclusive possession, therefore, of the necessary if not sufficient condition for salvation. Jesus, however, changes the term from "*Sperma*" to "*Tekna*," which is to say from DNA, or "seed," to "children."

When the Jews repeat, "Our father is Abraham," Jesus replies: "*Ei tekna tou Abraam este, ta erga tou Abraam epoieite.*" "If you were Abraham's children (*Tekna* not *Sperma*), you would do as Abraham did."

Once Jesus denies the Jews salvation through their DNA, or through their version of keeping the law, their differences become irreconcilable, and violence becomes inescapable. The "Jews" feel Jesus is casting aspersions on their parents. "We were not born of prostitution," they exclaim as anger builds. Jesus then pours gasoline on the fire. "If you were Abraham's children," Jesus tells them, casting their heritage in doubt,

> you would do as Abraham did.
> As it is, you want to kill me
> when I tell you the truth
> as I have learnt it from God;
> That is not what Abraham did.

The anger of the Jews and the truth of Christ collide, and out of the collision comes the new definition of what it means to be a "Jew"

"What you are doing," Christ tells the "Jews," "is what your father does."

The "Jews," sensing further insult, claim "We were not born of prostitution." But their biologism is beside the point. A child of God is known not by his DNA or *Sperma* but by what he does, as the "Jews" themselves would have to admit. The "Jews" claim to have God as their father, but their actions indicate the opposite. "If," Jesus reminds them, "God were your father, you would love me." Since the "Jews" do not love Christ, God is not their father. Either His interlocutors are Jews or Christ is a Jew, but according to St. John, both cannot be members of the same group. Indeed, they don't even speak the same language: "Do you know why you cannot take in what I say?" Christ asks the "Jews." "It is because you are unable to understand my language." Then chapter 8 reaches its crisis. The "Jews" are not children of God. Their father is Satan. "The devil," Jesus tells the "Jews," is your father and you prefer to do what your father wants."

The Jews are transformed by their encounter with Christ. Those who accept Him become the New Israel known as the Church. They are the true "children" of Abraham and Moses. Those who reject Christ become the "Jews" or followers of Satan. The "Jew," whose father is Satan, "a murderer and a liar from the beginning," defines himself by rejecting Christ and truth. At that moment, Israel ceases to be an ethnic designation. The old Israel was determined by DNA; it was the "seed" of Abraham. The new Israel, which "worships in spirit and truth," is determined entirely by behavior, most significantly acceptance of Christ and his message. The Church is the new Israel.

St. Paul's epistles are consistent with St. John's Gospel. "Not all those who descend from Israel are Israel," he writes in Romans 9:7, "not all the descendants of Abraham are his true children. Remember: it is through Israel that your name will be carried on, which means that it is not physical descent that decides who are the children of God; it is only the children of the promise who will count as the true descendants."

DNA is a chemical; children are acting individuals. The terms of election have changed. Only those "who follow this rule," Paul writes in Galatians 6:16, "form the Israel of God." Just as conscious choice and consistent behavior now form the sole basis for membership in the New Israel, the "Jews'" embrace of DNA is the basis for all subsequent ideologies of race from Nazism to Zionism. Proponents of race were always choosing more primitive formulations of community that led to intellectual bondage instead of the freedom based on choice proposed by the Gospels.

The confrontation between Jesus and the "Jews" leads first to a redefinition of the word "Jew." What used to refer to the chosen people, now refers to those who reject Christ. What used to be synonymous with Israel now means its opposite. St. John's use of "*hoi Iudaioi*" indicates one of the most profound and radical discontinuities in history. Those who, according to the "Jews,"

seem to reject the religion of Moses and Abraham are the true children of Moses and Abraham. They are the Church, the New Israel.

What then are the "Jews"? In Revelations 2:9, John defends the nascent Christian community against the "Jews" by reporting that "the slanderous accusations" against the Christians "have been made by people who profess to be Jews but are really members of the synagogue of Satan." He revisits the theme in Revelation 3:9, referring to "the synagogue of Satan" as "those who profess to be Jews but are liars, because they are no such thing." The angel visiting the beleaguered Christian community in Philadelphia will compel the "Jews" to "fall at your feet and admit that you are the people that I love." Just as the "Jews" who rejected Christ have a new name, "the synagogue of Satan," so the group of Jews which accepted him, now enlarged by Gentile converts, will henceforth be known as "the new Jerusalem which comes down from my God in Heaven." Later Christian writers tried to avoid the confusion which flows from these conflicting uses of the word "Jew" by referring to the Church as the "New Israel." Unlike the word "Jew," whose meaning changes dramatically, "Israel" has only positive connotations.

Christ's coming brought about what Wengst terms "a turning point in both religious economies."[38] The Church is now the true Israel, and the "the people who profess to be Jews" are in reality liars and members of the "synagogue of Satan." Once the term "Jew" is redefined, no further dialogue or compromise is possible. Jesus tells the "Jews," "Your father is Satan," and they repay the favor by determining to kill him, a decision which, Caron says, "confirms in dramatic fashion the diabolic identity of the Jews."[39]

Pseudo-Judaism—the term Caron proposes as synonymous with "*hoi Iudaioi*"—is responsible for the death of Christ. To remain Jews, Jews must accept Christ. Those who reject him become "the Jews," i.e., representatives not of the religion of Abraham and Moses, but rather adherents of a new ideology, which within the generation following Christ's death became the main source of revolutionary ferment in the Roman empire. Despite the scepticism of those like Gamaliel (Acts 5:33-40) who urged caution both in relation to Christian and to other messianic claims, the revolutionary ideology inexorably took hold. After this revolutionary ideology failed to conquer Rome, it went into dormancy for 1000 years only to re-emerge in Christian empires when the modern era began.

Attempting to put the Church's relationship with the Jews on a new footing after the Holocaust, the fathers of Vatican II issued *Nostra Aetate*, which said

> Even though the Jewish authorities and those who followed their lead pressed for the death of Christ (cf. John 19:6), neither all Jews indiscriminately at that time, nor Jews today, can be charged with the crimes committed during his passion. It is true that the Church is the

> new people of God, yet the Jews should not be spoken of as rejected or accursed as if this followed from Holy Scripture.[40]

One extrapolation from this passage is that the murder of Christ was a crime committed by some Jews at the time of Christ. In describing those people, *Nostra Aetate* identifies "Jewish authorities and those who followed their lead." St. John identifies them as "the chief priests and the guards," who shouted "Crucify him! Crucify him!" when Pilate presented Jesus wearing a crown of thorns and a purple robe. In the narrative leading up to the Passion, St. John identifies them as "the Jews." Jesus Himself identifies the group which is planning to kill Him in John 8:39:

> "They [i.e., the "Jews] repeated, 'Our Father is Abraham.' Jesus said to them: 'If you were Abraham's children, you would do as Abraham did. As it is, you want to kill me when I tell you the truth.'"

The group "who want to kill me" also claims "we are descended from Abraham," i.e., that they are Jews. And so those "Jews," with the collaboration of Pilate, killed Christ. Christ was killed not by "all Jews indiscriminately" but rather by the Jews who rejected Christ. According to Caron's reading, "the trial of Jesus and his condemnation is without equivocation the doing of the Jews. . . it is not the 'world' which killed Jesus, but rather the Johannine Jews."[41] "It is particularly significant that all of the references to the death of Jesus implicate the 'Jews.'"[42] The conclusion, especially in light of *Nostra Aetate*, is inescapable: the "Jews" (what Caron calls "*les Juifs johanniques*") killed Christ.

"How great was the woe caused by that one execution!" writes Graetz in his history of the Jews:

> How many deaths and sufferings of every description has it not caused among the children of Israel. Millions of broken hearts and tragic fates have not yet atoned for his death. He is the only mortal of whom one can say without exaggeration that his death was more effective than his life.[43]

Graetz in typically Jewish fashion is referring to the Crusades, the Inquisition, the pogroms and all other nameless tragedies when Jews died at the hands of at least nominal Christians as the fruit of Christianity. He is also being Jewish, in the sense in which St. John defined the word, in seeing Christianity as the source of Jewish woe. Graetz was right in seeing the death of Christ as the beginning of Jewish woes, but that calamity was self-inflicted, as were some, at least, of its results. However infamous the behavior of "Christian" persecutors, the original source is to be found elsewhere. The source of Jewish woe was the revolutionary spirit that proceeded inexorably from rejection of Christ. It was also the spirit of revolution which prompted Jews to reject Christ in the first place, whether those wanting a revolution or those, like Caiaphas, wanting to prevent such a revolution, with all it would entail. Jews

wanted a military leader who could defeat the Roman legions. They did not want a man that the Romans could put to death on the Cross. Of the Passion, Matthew writes:

> The passers-by jeered at him; they shook their heads and said, "So you would destroy the Temple and rebuild it in three days! Then save yourself! If you are God's son, come down from the Cross!" The chief priests with the scribes and elders mocked him in the same way. "He saved others," they said, "he cannot save himself. He is the king of Israel, let him come down from the Cross now, and we will believe in him."

Writing 1000 years after Christ's death, Maimonides established the criteria whereby his people could identify the Messiah. "If," he wrote,

> there arises a king from the House of David, versed in Torah [who] performs the commandments like David his ancestor. . . and wages a war of God, it is assumed that he is the Messiah. If he successfully does this and builds the Temple in its proper place and gathers the dispersed of Israel, behold, he is certainly the Messiah.[44]

Writing 800 years after Maimonides, Graetz says the same thing. "The only stumbling block to their ["Jewish"] belief lay in the fact that the Messiah who came to deliver Israel and bring to light the glory of the kingdom of heaven, endured a shameful death. How could the Messiah be subject to pain? A suffering Messiah staggered them considerably."[45]

Once again, the "Jews" defined themselves by their rejection of Christ, a decision with incalculable consequences. Once the "Jews" defined a suffering Christ as a contradiction in terms, they made their rejection of the Logos inevitable. And once they rejected the Logos, they paved the way for the rejection of all Logos. And once they did that, they embarked upon a path of revolutionary activity that brought woe upon them almost immediately. All of the acts of self-definition revolved around Christ; since the Jewish messiah could not be a suffering servant, he had to be a warrior king. Since the Jews did not rule their own nation, that warrior king would have to be a revolutionary who would overthrow the dominant political culture. By the time of Maimonides, the definition had become axiomatic. If the claimant did not fulfill political and revolutionary criteria, he was, ipso facto, not the Messiah. The Messiah had to be a revolutionary Jew. This, not persecution by Christians, was the deepest source of Jewish woe, because the revolutionary stance of the Jew, redefined throughout history from political insurrection to cultural subversion, brought on persecution in reaction: persecution affecting guilty and innocent alike.

By rejecting Logos, which was simultaneously the person of Christ and the order in the universe, including the moral order, which sprang from the divine mind, the "Jew" found himself drawn inexorably to revolution. The parents of the man born blind knew "the Jews. . . had already agreed to expel

from the synagogue anyone who should acknowledge Jesus as the Christ." Once the Christ was crucified, the "Jews" followed through on the threat. Brumlik states "the re-constitution of Judaism as rabbinical or pharisaical Judaism" began "with the introduction of the curse of the heretics of the 18 petition prayer."[46] This curse, which was leveled at new Christians, was formulated and implemented between 80 and 120 AD, which is when scholars say the Gospel of John was written. Judaism was a "*religio licita*" or permitted religion—a religion freed from offering sacrifice to the emperor. Exclusion from the synagogue must have inflicted severe hardship on Jewish followers of Jesus, because they thus also lost protection and social membership.

Brumlik denies exclusion from the synagogues took place when St. John says, i.e., at the time of Christ. He admits it affected Christians; however, he fails to see the more devastating effect on the "Jews" when it turned the synagogue into a cell of revolutionary activity. After Christ, Zealot influence over the "Jews" grew in direct proportion to the number of Jews expelled from the synagogue. That process culminated in overt revolution when the Jews rebelled against Roman hegemony in 66 AD.

The process is simple to understand. "The fanatics keep pushing the envelope," says Kevin MacDonald, "forcing other Jews to either go along with their agenda or to simply cease being part of the Jewish community."[47] MacDonald is discussing the development of Zionism, but his description applies equally to those who threatened the parents of the man born blind with expulsion. This dynamic has been at work throughout "Jewish" history from the time of Christ. (MacDonald traces it back further.) The Jews who objected to the hysteria that reigned when the Jews proclaimed Sabbatai Zevi their messiah were expelled from the synagogue, too. Some left town to save life and limb. In both instances, "the most radical elements" in the Jewish community "end up pulling the entire community in their direction."[48]

"The radicals who determined the direction of the Jewish community" after Christ's death were known as Zealots. Jews who followed Jesus were expelled from the synagogue, just as today: "Jews living in the Diaspora who do not support the aims of the Likud Party in Israel" are "being rooted out of the Jewish community."[49] Following Christ's death, the "Jews" became progressively more committed to revolutionary activity, which is to say, military operations, to throw off the yoke of Roman hegemony. The inexorable movement of the Jewish people toward revolution began when, as Matthew puts it, "The chief priests and elders. . . persuaded the crowd to demand the release of Barabbas and the execution of the Jesus." It was ratified when Annas and Caiaphas told Christ they could accept him as the Messiah if he came down from the Cross. The rejection of Christ was intimately bound up with the acceptance of Barabbas, the Zealot, i.e., choosing the revolutionary Jew over the suffering Christ. In choosing Barabbas, the "Jews" chose revolution. In rejecting Christ, the "Jews" chose revolution, setting in motion events that

led to Masada and greater tragedy beyond. Graetz cites Flavius Josephus, the assimilated Jew who wrote *The Jewish Wars*, as an authority, to establish the role of messianic revolutionary politics in the revolt against Rome: "According to Josephus, it was chiefly the belief in the imminent advent of a messianic king that launched the Jews upon the suicidal war which ended with the capture of Jerusalem and the destruction of the temple in AD 70. Even Simon bar-Kokhba, who led the last great struggle for national independence in AD 131, was still greeted as messiah."[30]

The insurrection of 66 AD began when Florus, a grasping, blundering Roman ruler, used a small riot in Jerusalem as a pretext for looting the Temple. The Jews rushed to defend the Temple, hurling stones at the Roman soldiers, barring their passage through the narrow entrance, and demolishing the colonnade leading from Fort Antonia. The revolution started inadvertently, but the way had already been prepared. The combination of Roman arrogance and Jewish expectation of the coming of a military messiah made conflict inevitable.

The Jewish population was divided between the Zealots and the peace party clustered around the rabbinical school of Hillel, among whom were King Agrippa and Princess Berenice. "[T]he party that favored revolution," clustered around the more rigorous school of Shammai.[31] When Florus' sack of the Temple was thwarted by popular resistance and the future of Jerusalem hung in the balance, Agrippa mounted the high gallery opposite the Temple, with the popular Princess Berenice at his side, and tried to persuade the people further resistance was futile and would lead to disaster. Many were moved by his arguments and felt that Roman hegemony without Florus might be workable, so Agrippa concentrated his rhetoric there. But when Agrippa tried to persuade the Jews to obey Florus until Rome replaced him, "the revolutionary party again won the upper hand, and Agrippa was obliged to flee from Jerusalem."[32]

The revolutionaries then controlled the Jewish people, who refused to pay taxes to Rome. Menahem, a descendant of Judas, the founder of the Zealots, captured the fortress of Masada, putting the Roman garrison to death. After grabbing the Roman arsenal, Menahem and his followers appeared on the field of battle to drive the Roman legions from Palestine.

Eleazar, leader of the Zealots, led his followers into the field, too. He "fanned the revolutionary spirit of the people and drove them on to complete rupture with Rome."[33] He persuaded the Jewish priests to stop offering the daily sacrifice for the emperor Nero, thus committing them to the revolution. Adherents of the school of Hillel claimed that it was unlawful to refuse the offerings of the heathen from the Temple, but their pleas fell on deaf ears. "The officiating priests . . . threw themselves without reserve into the maelstrom of revolution. From that time on, the Temple obeyed its chief, Eleazar, and became the hotbed of insurrection."[34] Hoping to avert draconian measures

from the Romans, Agrippa sent his cavalry to fight alongside of the remnants of the Roman garrison in Judaea, but they could not dislodge Eleazar and the Zealots from the Temple. The Zealots' counterattack drove the Romans from the city. The Sicarii, the terrorist faction under Menahem, named after their daggers, broke through the defenses of the fort where the Romans made their last stand and slaughtered them. The revolution liberated Jerusalem for a time.

Gravely underestimating the threat the Jewish revolutionaries posed, Nero dispatched his general Cestius, who left Antioch and descended on Jerusalem with 30,000 experienced soldiers. Like Nero, Cestius underestimated the revolutionary fervor of the Jews and mistakenly engaged them before the walls of Jerusalem, where they inflicted a stunning defeat on the Roman legions.

The emperor Nero, in Greece singing to the crowds and impressing them with his skill as a charioteer, trembled upon learning of Cestius' defeat, "for the revolution in Judaea might be the precursor of grave events."[55] The idea of revolution was essentially Jewish, practiced by Jews who had liberated their country from Rome, but it could be extrapolated and refined to apply to other nations. The Jewish revolutionaries posed a much greater threat to Roman hegemony than the rebellious members of other tribes, where issues never transcended the local.

The Jewish revolutionaries posed another threat because, like the Jews in Rome on Mount Vatican, there were colonies of Jews throughout the empire. Each was a potential revolutionary cell, emboldening Jews not only to revolt, but urging other subjugated ethnic groups to revolt too. The Jewish revolutionary vision was both ethnocentric and altruistic. As God's chosen people, they bore revolutionary liberation to the nations. Jewish revolutionaries saw themselves as the little stone that would shatter the Roman colossus not just for their own benefit but also for the benefit of the benighted gentiles, who would seek their own liberation under Jewish auspices.

So Nero had reason to tremble. He chose as the successor to the arrogant but unfortunate Cestius, Flavius Vespasian, who had subdued the barbaric Britons, and was one of the ablest generals of his age. Vespasian arrived in Judaea with almost twice as many soldiers as Cestius, but he arrived cautiously. Rather than meet the revolutionary Jews in open battle, where their enthusiasm could compensate for their lack of military experience, Vespasian cut the ground from under them one fortress at a time, knowing that in a landlocked nation, every hand that wielded a sword did not guide a plow. A long siege meant no planting or harvest. The Romans controlled the ocean; starvation became their most powerful weapon, as one city after another fell.

Although the Jews were losing the war, the remnant fleeing to Jerusalem thought the city impregnable. The idea of messianic revolution, not the size of their army, sustained the Jews. The Jews were "stimulated by their ardent belief that the messianic period so long foretold by the prophets, was

actually dawning, when every other nation of the earth would be given to the dominion of Israel."[56]

Not everyone was filled with enthusiasm. According to Graetz, "only the very young and men of no worldly position devoted themselves to the cause of the revolutionists."[57] The more sensible and the more prosperous were ready to capitulate and throw themselves on the mercy of the Romans. As the glow of the initial victories faded and the folly of rebelling against Rome became more apparent, the peace party became emboldened. Jewish adherents of the cause of Rome wrapped intelligence reports around the shafts of arrows and fired them into the Roman camp.

In February of the year 70 A.D., when Titus, son of Vespasian and heir to the imperial throne, appeared before Jerusalem, the city had maintained its independence for four years, a scandal to Rome that Titus had to resolve. Titus intended to deal leniently with the Jews, asking only that they acknowledge Rome's sovereignty and pay taxes, but the Jews refused. So Titus resolved to show no mercy. In March, Titus's army breached the outer wall of Jerusalem and seized the town of Bezetha. His offer of leniency spurned, Titus turned to cruelty to intimidate the besieged, crucifying 500 prisoners in a single day. Other prisoners he sent back with their hands cut off. Famine, more than Roman arms or cruelty, was taking a toll on the city, causing many Jews to surrender; they were then butchered. Cruelty was piled upon cruelty, but each time Titus called for negotiations he ran into the brick wall of Jewish messianism. John of Gischala was convinced that God would not abandon his people; he led the Jews into their last defensive position, the Temple itself, where they held off the Romans by setting fire to their own buildings.

When Jesus went to the Temple in Jerusalem for the last time He drew a different lesson from Daniel's messianic prophecies than the Zealots did. Discussing the Temple, Jesus told his disciples "not a single stone here will be left on another; everything will be destroyed." Jesus wept because the lost sheep of the house of Israel had chosen revolutionary politics, a decision that spelled catastrophe for the very people he came to save. "Jerusalem, Jerusalem, you that kill the prophets and stone those who are sent to you! How often have I longed to gather your children, as a hen gathers her chicks under her wings and you refused. So be it! Your house will be left to you desolate (Mt. 23:37-8)." The image of Christ as the mother hen spurned by her offspring found grim fulfillment a generation after his death when a woman who had fled to Jerusalem was driven beyond endurance by hunger and killed and devoured her own child. It was, Graetz remarked without irony, "as if not one line of the old prophecy concerning the doom of Judaea was to remain unfulfilled."[58]

Titus, sensing victory, decided to take the Temple without destroying it, but God had other plans. In August 70, one of the Roman soldiers who had beaten back a furious sally by the Jews climbed onto a comrade's back and hurled a flaming torch through the window of the Temple, where it set

fire to the wooden beams of the sanctuary. Soon the whole Temple was in flames. Titus ordered his troops to extinguish the blaze, but no one heeded him. Seized by the same curiosity that had gripped Pompey a century earlier, Titus made his way into the Holy of Holies. Titus was the last to gaze on the empty shrine at the heart of the Temple that would disappear, never to be rebuilt. Julian the Apostate tried to re-build the Temple 300 years later but the workmen were stymied by fire and brimstone explosions and work soon ceased. In the mid-1900s, Israel was restored as a nation in an act that the Jews of Middle Ages would have found astounding, but the Temple never got rebuilt. Titus had the last glimpse of the last remnant of the Jewish religion that revolved around Temple sacrifice. Judaism would be reconstituted as a religion of the book after the altar of sacrifice was destroyed.

As Titus contemplated the demise of something larger than he could understand in the Jewish Holy of Holies, the slaughter continued unabated in the Temple courtyard.

> Congregated clusters of trembling people from all the country beheld in the ascending flames the sign that the glory of their nation had departed forever. Many inhabitants of Jerusalem, unwilling to outlive their beloved Temple, cast themselves headlong into the fire. But thousands of men, women and children clung fondly to the inner court. Had they not been promised by the persuasive lips of false prophets, that God would save them by a miracle at the very moment of destruction? They fell but an easier prey to the Romans, who slew 6,000 on the spot. The Temple was burnt to the ground; only a few smoldering ruins were left, rising like gigantic ghosts from the ashes. A few priests escaped to the tops of the walls, where they remained without food for some days until they were compelled to surrender. Titus ordered their instant execution, saying "Priests must fall with their Temple." The conquering legions raised their standards in the midst of the ruins, sacrificed to their gods in the Holy Place and saluted Titus as emperor. By a strange coincidence the second Temple had fallen upon the anniversary of the destruction of the first Temple.[59]

"When you see the disastrous abomination of which the prophet Daniel spoke up in the holy place. . . then those in Judaea must escape to the mountains. . . . For then there will be great distress such as, until now, since the world began, there never has been nor never will be again [Mt. 24:15-16, 21]."

Within two months, Titus leveled Jerusalem's walls and established three camps to capture and execute the escaping soldiers. More than a million lives were lost in the siege. So many Jewish women and children were put on the block that the price for slaves collapsed. The Menorah, the golden table, and the scroll of the Law were taken as booty to Rome along with the mighty Jewish warrior Simon bar Giora, who was dragged through the streets of Rome and then thrown from the Tarpeian rock in sacrifice to the gods.

While it seemed the Jewish nation had perished in the aftermath of the siege, a remnant escaped to the Diaspora communities in Arabia, Egypt, and Cyrene, whence they took both their hatred of Rome and their revolutionary messianic politics. A remnant of the peace party also escaped. Sensing the revolution was leading to catastrophe, Jochanan ben Zakkai had himself smuggled out of besieged Jerusalem as a corpse wrapped in a shroud. When Titus' Jewish spies informed him that Jochanan was a friend of Rome, the Roman general granted him one request. Jochanan asked for permission to start a school. From this school, the new religion of Judaism arose. The Jews had no Temple, no burnt offerings, no priesthood, and no Sanhedrin or ruling body. All they had was a book, and out of this book they created a new religion. The role of the rabbi was now to comment on the book. The commentary was known as the Talmud, which became the basis of the new Jewish religion.

The Jewish revolutionaries lived on their fantasies of messianic omnipotence, even when messianic politics brought catastrophe to the Jewish people. The school of Jochanan and Hillel and the other friends of Rome, however, craved an opposite good, survival. The basis of their religion was the Pentateuch, upon which they built a superstructure of commentary. The Law guaranteed survival, but survival often dictated what was going to be the Law.

The political factions among the Jews became critical schools following the destruction of the Temple. The school of Shammai, having espoused the cause of the Zealots, now returned to espousing rigorism in scriptural exegesis. The School of Hillel became the school of peace with the Romans. After the Jewish religion was re-defined as a religion of the book, or of competing interpretations of the book, these two schools would define the options for generations of Jews. There would be Jews drawn to assimilation, after the model of Jochanan and Hillel, and there would be Jews drawn to political messianism, after the model of Eleazar the Zealot and the school of Shammai. Jewish life oscillated between these poles for two millennia, and the two options manifest themselves in various ways: Roy Cohn urging the death sentence for the Rosenbergs during the McCarthy era; or in contrast, Spinoza's excommunication by Rabbi Menasseh ben Israel's synagogue in Amsterdam. Jews could emulate Moses Mendelssohn on the one hand, or Theodor Herzl on the other; they could emulate David Brooks or Noam Chomsky.

Unfortunately, there was no way to adjudicate competing interpretations. The various interpretations were not organized on any scientific framework. The "Halacha" were deduced from the Pentateuch and appended randomly, handed down separately usually joined to the name of the authority from whom they were derived. They were then memorized and repeated, spawning new interpretations which were then strung together, memorized and repeated. There was no way to adjudicate between the authorities when they differed. This led to Averroism, the notion that the mind could hold two

contradictory truths, both of which were right. During a contentious debate between the schools of Shammai and Hillel, a voice from heaven announced "the teachings of both schools are the words of the living God, but practically the laws of Hillel only are to carry weight."[60] At another point, the rabbis concluded: "Every man according to his choice may follow the school of Hillel or of Shammai, but the decision of the school of Hillel shall be the only accepted interpretation of the Law."[61] By becoming a religion of the book, Judaism subverted the book upon which it was based:

> The contentions between the schools, which extended to various practical matters, brought about wide divergence in the view with regard to the Law and life. One teacher held some things to be permissible which another forbade. Thus, Judaism seemed to have two bodies of laws, or, according to the words of the Talmud—"The One Law had become two."[62]

With directives like this, the relationships between the schools became more acrimonious. By putting a premium on Jewish survival, the school of accommodation could not resolve its own disputes effectively. The Talmudic commentary was based ultimately upon the Law, but the commentary often contradicted what it commented on. "The written Law (that of the Pentateuch) and the oral Law (the Sopheric) from this time ceased to be two widely sundered branches, but were brought into close relations with each other, although the new rendering *certainly did violence to the words of Scripture.*"[63] As a result, the rabbis expected to achieve unity without truth. Dissenters were expelled from the synagogue; the rabbis had to be obeyed even if they were wrong. When Joshua showed that Gamaliel's calculation for the commencement of the month of Tishri, during which the day of Atonement was celebrated, was false, Gamaliel refused to yield and threatened Joshua with expulsion from the synagogue. To preserve unity, Dossa ben Harchinas persuaded Joshua to yield, reasoning "that the arrangements of a religious chief must be uncontested even if they are erroneous."[64] With thought like this in the party of peace and accommodation, the political messianism of the Zealots soon burst into flame again.

In 115, the Jews of Babylon revolted against Rome. The revolt soon spread. In Cyrenaica, the Jews slaughtered 200,000 Greeks and Romans. In Cyprus, where 240,000 Greeks were slain, the revolutionary Jews leveled Salamis. So great was the local revulsion in Cyprus that the Jews living there were exterminated 30 years later. After that, a law decreed that no Jew would be allowed to set foot on the island, not even Jews shipwrecked off its coast.

The normally docile Jews in Egypt were also seized with revolutionary fervor, indiscriminately massacring Greeks and Romans. After plundering towns near Alexandria, the Jews boldly attacked the Roman army under the general Lupus. In their first encounter, the revolutionary spirit of the Jews triumphed over the military experience of the Romans, and Lupus fled. When

terrorized Greeks and Romans took to ship on the Nile, the Jews followed them bent on revenge. The historian Appian, living then in Alexandria, wrote an account that "gives some idea of the terror excited by the Jewish populations."[65] The Jews "are said to have eaten the flesh of the captive Greeks and Romans, to have smeared themselves in the skins torn off them." Graetz finds this difficult to believe because these actions "are quite foreign to Jewish character and customs." However, he concedes, "it is probably true that the Jews made the Romans and Greeks fight with wild animals or in the arena."[66] He characterizes this as "a sad reprisal" for what Titus and Vespasian did after the rebellion of 66.[67]

In Judaea, the rebellion was led by Julianus and Pappus, Jews from Alexandria. Like his predecessor Nero, Trajan especially feared the rebellious Jews because Jewish revolution was never merely local, since it was based on the Jewish messianic idea applicable to all oppressed ethnic groups, and because there were Jewish colonies throughout the empire. Then, as during the Bolshevik revolution in Russia, the Jews in the revolutionary vanguard could mobilize far greater numbers because of the message of Jewish revolution—the messianic idea they had derived from Daniel, the idea of resistance to political authority they had derived from Maccabees, and the idea of deliverance they had derived from Exodus—had universal application. Jesus' statement, "Salvation is from the Jews," would take on a political significance unintended by Jesus as Jews gravitated toward leadership in one revolutionary movement after another. The revolution against Rome was the first post-Christian attempt to put revolutionary Jewish principles into practice. The Jews—Trajan probably understood this—were motivated by an idea that was every bit as powerful as the idea of Rome. As a result, Trajan sent the cruel Moor Quietus to crush the rebellion.

Trajan died in 117; news of his death fanned the rebellion into an inferno that threatened to bring the empire down in flames. Captive nations seemed caught up in revolution, willing to test it with their lives against Rome's military might. Trajan's successor Hadrian lacked the brutal will of his predecessors. He arranged limited self-government for the provinces to the East and was even open to making concessions to the Jews. Quietus was called back to Rome and, in a gesture of reconciliation with the Jews, was executed at the command of the emperor. In peace negotiations, the Jews asked Hadrian for permission to rebuild their Temple. Hadrian, to their surprise and delight, acceded. What followed, however, were years of broken promises by Hadrian and unfulfilled expectations for the Jews. Hadrian had second thoughts. Magnanimity to subjugated peoples was unprecedented imperial behavior. The Jews became more impatient and more inclined to act on their growing revolutionary fervor.

In 130, Hadrian came to Palestine to meet the rebellious Jews. The Samaritans, who probably worshipped him as a god to curry favor, soon

began to poison his mind, claiming reconstruction of the Temple was the first step the Jews planned to declare independence from Rome. As a result, Hadrian backed away from his promises. The Jews could build their Temple, but not on the original site or on a scale as large as the original. The Jews, "filled with the idea of rebellion" anyway, were not disposed to put up with Hadrian's prevarication.

Hadrian remained in Syria for a year. When he left for Egypt, he thought the issue was resolved. Jerusalem would be rebuilt as a pagan city, which would hasten the assimilation of the Jewish race into the Roman Empire. Racial and religious differences would disappear. All would be Romans, nothing more, nothing less. The Jewish revolutionaries, however, were plotting rebellion. The Romans' weapons, fashioned by Jewish armaments makers, were deliberately weak and meant to fail in battle, because the Jews knew they would have to face them soon.

Hadrian's departure was the signal for rebellion. Well planned, it broke out seemingly miraculously, taking Hadrian by surprise. Equally miraculous was the emergence from nowhere of Simon bar Kokhba, the military leader of the Jews. Virtually nothing is known about him, other than his name. Kokhba (or Cochba) means "star," as the "star which has arisen in David." Kokhba was a play on his real name, Bar-Kosiba, referring to the town of his birth. For a short time, bar Kokhba was the terror of the Roman Empire, a military figure not unlike Hannibal, another Semite whose daring and skill threatened the Roman Empire. Like Hannibal, bar Kokhba threatened Roman hegemony over the Mediterranean.

Because he personified the military leader they had longed for, the Jews proclaimed Simon bar Kokhba their messiah. In him, the Jews found everything they thought lacking in Christ. Bar Kokhba was "the perfect incarnation of the nation's will and the nation's hate, spreading terror around and standing as the center-point of an eventful movement."[68] Bar Kokhba was the messiah that the Jews wanted because he "turned the small, defeated Jewish nation into a mighty force that, for a short while, pushed back the mightiest empire the world has ever known."[69] Resnick adds without the slightest sense of irony "Bar Kokhba was a glimpse into the future, a glimpse that enabled the Jews to know that one day, the Messiah will truly come."[70]

Bar Kokhba was proclaimed messiah by Rabbi Akiba, who also gave him the name "star." Akiba "was confirmed . . . in his hopes that the Roman power would soon be overthrown, and that the splendors of Israel would once more shine forth, and he looked forward through this means to the speedy establishment of the Messianic kingdom."[71] Bar Kokhba was proclaimed messiah largely because the Jews, by expelling the Christian Jews from their synagogues, had become revolutionaries who defined their messiah in exclusively political and military terms: "The outstanding quality that is attributed to [the messiah] is that when his identity is revealed, the kings of

the land will tremble when they hear of it; they will fear and shake and their kingdoms will plot how to stand against him, by sword or other means."[72] Of course, according to a counter-tradition, the false messiah "causes Israel to be slain by the sword, to scatter those who remain, and to humiliate them. He abolishes the Torah and deceives most of the world to serve a deity other than God."[73] Again, the Jews had no way to adjudicate competing claims; revolutionary fervor ended the debate by sweeping everyone into a movement headed for disaster.

As when Sabbatai Zevi was declared the messiah in 1666, the verdict was virtually unanimous, but not completely. Rabbi Jochanan Ben Torta remained skeptical. When he heard Akiba had proclaimed Bar Kokhba the messiah, he exclaimed, "Sooner shall grass grow from thy chin, Akiba, than that the Messiah will appear."[74] But his voice was ignored, as the Jews had ignored prophets like Jeremiah, who (in Resnick's words) had warned: "do not rebel against the government; do not try to hasten the End of Days, do not reveal the mysteries of Torah and do not leave the Diaspora by force; otherwise, why should the Messiah have to come."[75] Bar Kokhba did what Jeremiah forbade, but the all but unanimous acclaim he received as messiah increased his power and helped him unite the Jewish people.

Bar Kokhba demanded that all Christian Jews deny Jesus and make war against the Romans. Those who refused were declared traitors, punished with heavy penalties. The process that had begun when the parents of the man born blind were threatened with expulsion from the synagogue reached its completion. Now there was no longer any question. To be a Jew meant to be a revolutionary. Ethnos and religion disappeared into the political ideology of the revolutionary movement, which would henceforth masquerade, depending on the circumstan-ces, as both ethnos and religion. The Jewish Christians were considered blasphemers and spies, because "they refused to take part in the national war."[76] Bar Kokhba was not only the alternative to Christ, he also fulfilled Christ's prophecy that others would come "saying I am Christ, and shall deceive many." Bar Kokhba's coming was accompanied by "wars and rumors of wars," at a time when the Christian Jews were going to be beaten in the synagogues, and when they were hated by all. Christ also predicted unprecedented suffering, a prediction the Jewish Christians kept alive as their co-ethnics got swept up in the hysteria and euphoria leading to war.

After Akiba proclaimed Bar Kokhba the messiah, Jewish warriors from throughout the Roman Empire poured into Jerusalem to fight at his side. Jewish sources claim Bar Kokhba had 400,000 troops. Dio Cassius, the pagan historian, puts the number at 580,000. To test his troops' ferocity and obedience, Bar Kokhba asked them to bite off the end of a finger, and 200,000 complied. The size of the army was impressive, but when combined with the fervor of the revolutionary ideology and significant numbers of heathens who made common cause with the Jews, the "revolt became one

of great dimensions," and the entire Roman empire was in jeopardy from a blow "by which the various members of its gigantic body were to be rent asunder."[77] According to Dio Cassius, "All Judaea had been stirred up. Many other nations joined them for personal gain. The whole earth, one might say, was stirred up in the matter."[78]

The rebellion of Bar Kokhba was no local matter; it was a struggle over who was going to rule the world. Jewish revolutionary thought never settled for a smaller stage. The same was true of Bolshevism and Neoconservatism; each had the same universal scope. *Aut munda aut nihil* could have been the motto of Jewish revolution. Once the Talmud became the essence of the redefinition of Judaism as anti-Christian, Judaism espoused a political view antithetical to what it perceived as Christian otherworldiness. It committed the Jews to messianic politics. According to Resnick's reading of the Talmud, "the major distinction of the messianic era will be political."[79] The Talmud looked forward to heaven on earth when a political messiah would reign over a universal political system. Resnick's account of that millennial era shows its uncanny similarities to the Jewish utopias proposed by Marx, Trotsky, and the Neoconservatives:

> The Messianic Era will herald the onset of a single, universal political system, with the messiah at its helm. There will no longer be localized concern over natural resources. The spirit of universal cooperation and brotherhood will reign supreme. There will no longer be the need to accumulate wealth. . . . There will no longer be diverse cultures and philosophies. Just as in the very beginning of time, a single man was created, so, too in the end of days, all Mankind will unite as a single entity. There will no longer be the need for war.[80]

Finally, the millennial universal revolutionary political system will abolish the nations because:

> History has taught us that in a world divided into various nations, no nation can achieve eternal independence or perpetual self-reliance. But in a one-world political entity, true independence can be achieved. Man can turn his focus to the realm of the spirit and strive for moral perfection and intellectual excellence. The Messianic Era will usher in the rebirth of virtue, a renaissance of spirituality and an understanding of God's will. The world will experience a spiritual revival that will result in the perfection of the human condition. Man will achieve the same state of godliness as on the day he was created. "The wolf shall dwell with the lamb."[81]

With huge numbers of Jews pouring into Judaea and a revolutionary fervor to match their number, the "warlike messiah" drove the Roman legions out of Palestine. The Governor of Judaea was stunned by the size and power of the military force arrayed against him. He retreated under its blows, abandoning

in the first year 50 fortresses and 985 towns and villages. Like Nero who watched the impetuous Cestius go down to defeat in 66, Hadrian had to send one general after another packing before he found someone the equal of Bar Kokhba, who, in the ultimate act of defiance, had coins struck bearing his image. Known as Bar-Kokhba coins or more tellingly "coins of the revolution," they made explicit what was already obvious to the entire world. The Jews had defied Rome and created their own state. They were a model to any other ethnic group which felt oppressed by Rome, and as such they were a threat to the existence of Rome itself. The Jewish revolution had thrown off the Roman yoke. Akiba was right: Bar Kokhba had proven he was the messiah.

In Julius Severus, who had just put down a rebellion in Britain, Hadrian eventually found the general who was Bar Kokhba's equal. Arriving in Judaea, Severus found the Jews so firmly entrenched that a quick and decisive victory was out of the question. Like the less impetuous and more effective of his predecessors, Severus took advantage of Roman control of the seas and put hunger to work as his most effective weapon. With the blockade in place, Severus reconquered Judaea one village and town at a time.

During Severus' campaign, which lasted years and extended over more than 50 battles, the tide turned against Bar Kokhba. Rabbi Akiba was captured and executed after an extended stay in prison. Deemed strategically indefensible, Jerusalem was abandoned to the Romans, and on the 9th of Ab (August), the day on which the second Temple had been destroyed in 70 AD, the Roman governor plowed up the Temple mount and offered sacrifice there to Roman gods. It was not a good omen.

The Jews retreated to the fortress of Bethar, and there, like their messianic forebears who had perched atop Masada 70 years before, they assumed that God would protect them. The Romans settled in for a year-long siege which was to be the culmination of a three and a half years war of attrition. Eusebius states that Bethar was besieged in the 18th year of Hadrian's reign (134 AD), about two years after the revolt, and that its fall was caused by hunger and thirst.

The Jews almost outlasted the Romans. According to one account, Bar Kokhba snatched defeat from the jaws of victory by killing the pious Eleazar, whose prayers were holding off the Romans, and whom he suspected of conniving with a Samaritan spy. When Eleazar died, a voice was heard from heaven saying, "thou hast lamed the arm of Israel and blinded his eyes; therefore shall thine arm and thine eye lose their power."[82]

Another account says the Romans were ready to call off the siege when two Samaritan brothers imprisoned by the Jews threw a detailed map of the city's subterranean passages over the city's walls to the Romans. Taking advantage of the Sabbath, Roman soldiers forced their way into the city, and a bloodbath ensued. Horses were said to wade through blood up to their nostrils. The tide of blood was said to have washed bodies to the sea. Dio Cassius claims that

half a million Jews were slaughtered in addition to those who died of fire and starvation. The Romans suffered great losses too, but Bar Kokhba was captured; his head was brought to Hadrian. Bethar fell on the most fateful date in Jewish history, the 9th of Ab.

The Jewish population of Judaea was largely exterminated in the repression that followed Bethar's fall. Hadrian established three military stations to capture the fugitives and execute them; women and children were sold into slavery in the markets of Hebron and Gaza, as in the first revolt. Towns that offered any resistance were leveled; Judaea was "literally converted into a desert."[83] Those who could escape went to Arabia, where their descendants played a role in the rise of Islam. In place of Jerusalem, Hadrian built Aelia Capitolina, a new city slightly to the north in the Greek style. On the Temple Mount, instead of the temple promised to the Jews, Hadrian erected a column in his own honor and a temple in honor of Jupiter Capitolinus. So completely was Jerusalem eradicated that "a hundred years later a governor of Palestine asked a bishop, who said he came from Jerusalem, where that town was situated."[84]

The catastrophe following the short violent reign of the messiah Bar Kokhba did not bring an end to the Jewish people—although it almost did just that—but it did end Jewish messianic politics for a while. For more than one thousand years, during which Christianity supplanted Rome and established its hegemony over Europe, the Jewish revolutionaries largely held their peace. The bloody suppression of the Bar Kokhba revolution brought about "the annihilation of political nationalism" which "put an end both to the apocalyptic faith and to the militancy of the Jews."[85]

Hadrian made a lasting impression on the Jews. After his governor plowed up the Temple Mount, the Jews concentrated on survival. The religion of the book took a back seat to the religion of ethnic survival, which would henceforth dictate the meaning of the book. Once again, the rabbis disputed one another. One group claimed "every Jew. . . should be ready to die the death of a martyr."[86] The faction of Shammai, though, said, "outwardly and under compulsion, one might transgress the Law in order to preserve one's life."[87] The assembly at Lydda took a middle course, distinguishing between "important precepts and those which are less weighty." Finally a decision was reached that "all laws might be broken, with the exception of those prohibiting idolatry, adultery, and murder" in order "to avoid death by torture."[88] Graetz comments: "It was touching to note the petty tricks and pious frauds by which they endeavored to avoid death and yet to satisfy their conscience. The mental tortures which they suffered daily and hourly made them skillful in discovering loopholes of escape."[89]

The search for loopholes became a defining characteristic of the Jewish race. The law could henceforth be transgressed in the interest of survival. As one example:

> The two authorities of Tiberias, Jonah and Jose, taught that it was lawful to bake for Ursicinus on the Sabbath, and the teachers of Neve, a Gaulanite town, permitted leavened bread to be baked for the legions during Passover. In their distress the religious representatives quieted their consciences with the excuse, which they deluded themselves into believing, that the enemy did not expressly demand the transgression of the law, but simply required the regular supply of the army. But Ursicinus' intention appears really to have been to institute a religious persecution.[90]

The notion that "it is better, for a time, that religious laws should be transgressed"[91] was not endorsed by Jews who became Christians. Christians died rather than offer incense to the emperor. Many died rather than violate their faith. They were known as "martyrs," which means "witnesses." And those who listened to their witness often concluded that they died believing their faith to be true, which led many to accept their faith.

The opposite conclusion applies to the Jews. If they were not willing to die for their religion, then it was probably not true. It was as if the Jews understood that with the fall of the Temple they had created a new religion, and that no one was willing to put his life on the line to attest to its authenticity. Jewish religion became a religion of ethnic survival, which became its highest good. The notion that survival somehow allowed the transgression of religious laws found no precedent in scripture. The books of Daniel and Maccabees show that a Jew must accept death rather than transgress the law of God. Christians now hold this position, but not the Jews. The fact that Christians took the position of Daniel and the Maccabees while the Jews repudiated it shows the continuity from Moses to the Church, as Christ indicated, not from Moses "to those who call themselves Jews," in St. John's words.

Graetz mocks the Jewish penchant for discovering "loopholes of escape," but he ignores the role it played in handing victory over Rome to the Christians.[92] By siding with Bar Kokhba, the rabbis made the split with their Christian co-ethnics inevitable and bitter when it finally came. The Christians conquered Rome because they had been expelled from the synagogue. Had they remained in the synagogue, they would have undoubtedly been compromised by the religion of ethnic survival, which compromised everything it came in contact with, including the Torah, its nominal basis and *raison d'être*. "From the time of Hadrian," we are told, "all connection between Jews and Christians ceased."[93] The Bar Kokhba Revolution made the split final and irrevocable. As if to show their independence, the Christians chose an uncircumcised heathen as their bishop. Jews and Christians, henceforth, "no longer occupied the position of two hostile bodies belonging to the same house, but they became two entirely distinct bodies."[94] Paganism, a religion nourished by and in turn breeding "irrational ideas, deceit, and immorality,"[95] was replaced inevitably by ethical monotheism. Mankind cannot pretend it doesn't know certain things. Once Jewish religion and Greek philosophy were transmitted

throughout the Mediterranean basin by Roman infrastructure, mankind could not return to placating irrational and petulant gods. Revulsion at Jewish revolutionary excess and contempt at the supine behavior that often followed it meant that heathens would not accept the religion of the "Jews" either. That left Christianity, the revised and renewed religion of Moses, Abraham, and Christ, alone in the field. After years of contention, Rome submitted to baptism. Following Constantine's conversion, "the last thread" connecting "Christianity with its parent stock" snapped at the Council of Nicaea when the Church decided that it would not rely on the Jewish calendar to calculate the date of Easter. "For," Constantine wrote, "it is unbecoming beyond measure that on this the holiest of festivals we should follow the custom of the Jews. Henceforward, let us have nothing in common with this odious people; our Savior has shown us another path."[96] Citing Constantine, Graetz claims "The first utterance of Christianity on the very day of its victory betrayed its hostile attitude towards the Jews and gave rise to those malignant decrees of Constantine and his successors, which laid the foundation of the bloody persecution of subsequent centuries."[97]

But history belies his claim. Persecution of the Jews was, as at the time of Masada and Bethar, a function of revolutionary activity. It was oftentimes a reaction to Jewish participation in revolutionary activity, as in Cyprus during the second century and in Eastern Europe in the 1920s and 1930s. But the idea of revolution has a life of its own. The temptation to "judaize" has never left Christianity, and Christian writers who understood the pull of the "Jewish" idea denounced Judaizers as dogs that returned to their vomit. In the Middle Ages, as Christian cultural hegemony over Europe reached its zenith, the Jewish idea of heaven on earth would burst forth again. The dogs would return to their vomit, and Jews would be the first to feel its effects.

Chapter Two

The Arian Crisis of the 4th Century

Christianity became a favored religion in the Roman Empire, endowed with great patronage, after Constantine issued the Edict of Milan in 313 AD, thus legalizing Christianity. Constantine came to his decision after receiving a vision in a dream that he would conquer his enemies if he fought them under the sign of the Cross. Acting on that dream led to a decisive victory at the Battle of the Milvian Bridge on October 12, 312.[1]

After suffering through centuries of persecution, the Church suddenly found herself confronted with a new set of problems which revolved around the role which the emperor played in the life of Church governance. Undue political interference on the part of the sovereign in Church affairs has come to be known as Caesaro-Papism because whenever a "Catholic prince" arrogates to himself the office of pope, "princely benevolence threatens to transform the mystical body of Christ into a department of State."[2] Not content with interfering in the administrative details of Church life which would seem pertinent to imperial rule, Constantine, who remained a catechumen after his conversion and did not receive baptism until he was on his death bed, weighed in on one of the thorniest theological issues in the history of the Church.

In late November 311, Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, noticed a boy on the beach playing at being bishop with his friends on the anniversary of the martyrdom of Peter, Alexander's immediate predecessor. Taking the coincidence as a sign, Alexander decided to adopt and educate the boys and their leader, Athanasius, who, after showing exceptional promise, "became a deacon and Alexander's trusted assistant."[3] Archibald Robertson claims that Athanasius came from a wealthy family and got a classical education which allowed him to cite Plato and Aristotle, as well as developments in Neo-Platonism.[4] Timothy D. Barnes maintains the opposite, claiming that Athanasius was a "man of the people," who did not come from wealth or position. The education Athanasius received was "primarily religious," not classical, and "he studied non-Christian matters only enough to avoid seeming either to be totally unacquainted with them or to have decided to despise them out of sheer ignorance!"[5]

Either way, the crisis which Athanasius was destined to resolve required a knowledge of both Scripture and philosophy. Athanasius never doubted that Christian theology had "triumphed over pagan philosophy,"[6] or that the wisdom of the Greeks had been found wanting and that the demons who infested the practice of Neo-Platonism in his age had lost their former power. But he also understood that the theologians of his age could not make sense of the relationship between the persons of the Trinity without making use of Greek concepts like *ousia* and *hypostasis* if they wanted to explain how Christ was both truly God and truly man.

The orthodox were reluctant to make sacred mysteries a matter of public debate, but the heretics forced their hand. In 318 a Libyan priest by the name of Arius arrived in Alexandria and within a year he had acquired a following among that city's faithful as a charismatic preacher and a theological trouble maker who made a name for himself among that city's new converts and consecrated virgins by accusing Bishop Alexander of Sabellianism, a heresy which maintained that the Father and the Son were different modes of the same being rather than distinct persons. Arius argued that "if the Son were truly a Son He must have had a beginning, and that there had been therefore a time when He did not exist."[7] This meant that the Son was a creature, albeit an exalted creature high above anything else in creation, but not God, an idea congenial to that city's Jews and new converts, who either struggled in vain to understand the Trinity or were actively hostile to the very idea. Challenged publicly, Alexander was "at first conciliatory" and tried to give Arius a fair hearing, but after it became clear that Arius was more interested in creating a political movement than clarifying a theological issue, he handed management of the crisis to his deacon Athanasius, who brought about the condemnation of Arianism in 325.

The theological problem at the heart of the Church's understanding of this issue began with the prologue to the Gospel of St. John, when the evangelist stated first that Logos was with God and then that Logos was God. How can something or someone be both God and with God? The answer to that question was a theological concept, based on Scripture but derived with the help of Greek philosophy, known as the Trinity. When St. John referred to God as the Logos, he was claiming that the Deity was simultaneously the rational order of the universe and a person. Logos expressed the first characteristic; the second characteristic found better expression in the term "Son." By calling him His Son, God the Father signifies that the Logos is real, which is to say He is a person with the power to act, rather than simply an intellectual concept which needs to be put into effect. "The Son," says Athanasius:

> is the Word and Wisdom of the Father: from which titles we infer His spiritual and indivisible derivation from the Father, inasmuch as the word (or reason) of a man is not part of him, nor when exercised, implies any

> change in the immaterial principle; much less, therefore, is it so with the Word of God. On the other hand, the Father calls Him His Son, lest, from hearing only that He was the Word, we should fail to consider Him as real, whereas the title of Son, designates Him as an existing Word, and a substantial Wisdom.[8]

St. Paul underscores the same point when he claims that "the Word of God is alive and active and keener than a two-edged sword." To deny the divinity of the Son is to deny the power of the Word, but, since St. John also claimed that the Son is the Logos in a special way, to deny the divinity of the Son is also to say that God is "alogos," without reason. The irrationality of God became a serious problem in Islam because it derived its understanding of the Son from Nestorian heretics, who denied that Christ was God. By claiming that Logos existed from the beginning and that Logos was God, John was saying that there was never a time when there wasn't a plan in the mind of a Being who had the power to carry that plan to completion in human history. Athenagoras says that the Son is "the first offspring of the Father; not as made, for God being Mind Eternal, had from the beginning reason (τὸν λόγον) in Himself, being eternally intellectual (λογικός); but that He is so, as issuing forth." Taken together, "Son" and "Logos" are the data of revelation out of which philosophical reason constructs the doctrine of the Trinity. According to Cardinal Newman, "Of the two titles ascribed in Scripture to our Lord, that of the Logos expresses, with peculiar force, His co-eternity in the One Almighty Father. On the other hand, the word Son has more reference to His derivation and ministrative office."[9]

Jesus Christ was both the Logos Incarnate and the Son of God, which made him simultaneously imminent and transcendent in a way that resolved the dichotomy which had plagued Greek philosophy for even longer than the Trinitarian mystery puzzled Christianity. Aristotle's god, known as the uncaused cause and the unmoved mover, was an eminently transcendent principle, but it was not a person in any recognizable sense and as a result the unmoved mover had no clear relationship to the world of immanence in which men lived and moved and had their being. Plato's demiurge, or worker of the people, on the other hand, was intimately involved in the affairs of men, but because of that the demiurge lacked God's transcendence. Gnosticism was an early attempt to link the two attributes of God by way of intermediary beings or emanations, which were associated with the spheres, in which the stars and planets were embedded:

> The oriental doctrine of Emanations was at a very early period combined with the Christian theology. According to the system of Valentinus, a Gnostic heresiarch, who flourished in the early part of the second century, the Supreme Intelligence of the world gave existence to a line of Spirits or Eons; who were all more or less partakers of His nature, i.e. of a nature

> specifically the same, and included in His glory (πλήρωμα), though individually separate from the true and sovereign Deity. It is obvious, that such a doctrine as this abandons the great revealed principle above described, the incommunicable character and individuality of the Divine Essence.[10]

The Gnostics felt that "the emanations from the Deity were eternal with Himself, and were considered as the result, not of His will and moral energy, but of the necessary laws to which He was subjected; a doctrine which was but fatalism in another shape."[11] Like Hegel at a later date, the Manichees said that the Son and Spirit were a "necessary emanation" from the Father. In doing this they introduced "a sort of materialism into their notion of the Deity"[12] and made God the slave of fate. When Christian Neo-Platonists adopted the concept of emanations as a way of closing the gap between a transcendent God and an immanent world, they infringed upon the roles of Christ as the Son and Word. Sensing that this was leading back to pantheism, the orthodox chose the Greek term προβολὴ as providing a better explanation of the relationship of the Son to the Father. Based on a definition which described "anything which proceeds, or is sent forth from the substance of another, as the fruit of a tree, or the rays of the sun," προβολὴ eventually got incorporated into the Nicene Creed when it described the relationship of the Son to the Father as "light from light, true God from true God," meaning that "the radiance is not the sun, and yet not foreign to it."[13] The fact that the term προβολὴ had been used by heretics did not disqualify its use by the orthodox, who saw it as the best explication of the term ὁμοούσιον, which had also been misappropriated by heretics. According to St. Athanasius, "The substance (οὐσία) of the Son is not external to the Father, or created; but it is by natural derivation from that of the Father, as the radiance comes from light. For as the radiance is not the sun, and yet not foreign to it, so is there an effluence, (ἀπόῤῥοια, Wisd. 7:25) from the Father's substance (οὐσία) though it be indivisible. For as the sun remains the same without infringement of its nature, though it pour forth its radiance, so the Father's substance is unchangeable, though the Son be its Image."[14] Rather than let the heretics control the narrative in a process which led inexorably to pantheism by imposing some sort of material necessity on God, the Alexandrians appropriated the term προβολὴ and all that it entailed as a way of articulating the relationship between the Father and the Son, as well as the Son's influence in creation.

For the two centuries which followed the publication of the Gospel of St. John, theologians struggled to reconcile the relationship between the old philosophical conundrum of immanence and transcendence, by using terms from revelation like "Logos" and "son." Hughes sees the Arian heresy as an attempt to "reconcile rationally the truths that there is but one God, that the Logos incarnate in Jesus Christ is God, and that the Logos is yet admittedly

distinct from the Father," but this caused problems for a group of people who had been schooled in Greek philosophical concepts but were newcomers to Hebrew revelation. "If the Father is God," they reasoned, "and if God is one only, and if the Logos is not the Father, how is the Logos God?"[15] The third century heretic Paul of Samosata tried to resolve the issue by denying that the Logos was God. His views were adopted by Lucian, a theology professor who taught both Arius and his classmate Eusebius of Nicomedia, the prelate who protected Arius from his opponents and turned what began as a theological dispute into a political movement.

The Arian crisis was a tale of two cities: Alexandria and Antioch. Although originally from Antioch, Arius was a trouble-maker, skilled in the sophistical perversion of Aristotelian dialectic, who launched his career in Alexandria by calling the local bishop a Sabellian tritheist. If Judaizing was the Achilles heel of the Church in Antioch, sophistry played a similar role in Alexandria, which prized its reputation for orthodoxy in an otherwise compromised eastern Church.

But the dispute was not simply doctrinal. As Christianity became the favored religion in the Roman Empire, theological disputation became a way of attracting the attention of the emperor and thereby gaining political power. The personality of Arius played a role as well. Newman calls him "turbulent by character" and a notorious "offender against ecclesiastical order," who saw an attack on the bishop of Alexandria as a way of currying favor with the Antioch faction.[16]

Arius's skill in "the art of disputation"[17] recommended him to the Alexandrians, who took Paul's speech at the Areopagus as their model and were careful not to scorn the contributions which pagan philosophy had made as a guide to a deeper understanding of the truths of revelation. Once Paul sailed to Greece after having been expelled from the synagogues of Asia Minor, philosophy became the *lingua franca* which allowed him to discuss Christianity with people unfamiliar with the Hebrew scriptures. Philosophy was not only necessary to proclaim the Faith, it was necessary to understand it as well for it was impossible to come to a creed based on an understanding of the Trinity without the use of philosophical concepts. "Even Athanasius," according to Newman:

> whose very gift it was, above all other Fathers, to possess a clear and accurate knowledge of the Catholic doctrine, so that all succeeding antagonists of Arianism may be truly said to have derived their powers and their arguments from him; even this keen and vigilant champion of orthodoxy, in arguing with the Gentiles for the divinity and incarnation of the Word, urges them with considerations drawn from their own philosophical notions concerning Him. Not that he was ignorant how unlike orthodoxy, and how like Arianism, such notions were, but he bore in mind the necessity of favourably disposing the minds of the Gentiles

> to listen to his teaching; and he was aware that it was one thing to lay the rudiments of the faith in an ignorant or heathen mind, and another to defend the faith against heretics, or to teach it dogmatically.[18]

Schooled in Greek philosophy, the Alexandrians understood that there is something true in every religion, but they also understood that heathen philosophers were innocent in a way that apostates and heretics were not and that to the latter, no accommodation could be made. Origen and the Church Fathers of his day "were not unwilling to be on a footing of intercourse with the heathen philosophers of their day, in order, if it were possible, to lead them into the truth; but deliberate heretics and apostates, those who had known the truth, and rejected it, were objects of their abhorrence, and were avoided from the truest charity to them."[19] Ever since St. John the Evangelist made the decision to write his gospel in Greek and employ the philosophical terminology which existed in that language, Christians understood that:

> The philosophy of the Greeks, limited and particular as it is, contains the rudiments of that really perfect knowledge which is beyond this world, conversant in intellectual objects, and those still more spiritual, which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor the heart of man conceived, before they were made clear to us by our Great Teacher, who reveals the holy of holies, and still holier truths in an ascending scale, to those who are genuine heirs of the Lord's adoption.[20]

Because God had placed what the Greeks called "*logoi spermatikoi*" at the heart of creation itself, even pagan philosophers could attain not only an understanding of the existence of God, as Paul pointed out in his letter to the Romans, but an inchoate understanding of the Trinity as well. In fact, Newman claims that:

> It is unquestionable that, from very early times, traditions have been afloat through the world, attaching the notion of a Trinity, in some sense or other, to the First Cause. Not to mention the traces of this doctrine in the classical and the Indian mythologies, we detect it in the Magian hypothesis of a supreme and two subordinate antagonist deities, in Plutarch's Trinity of God, matter, and the evil spirit, and in certain heresies in the early Church, which, to the Divine Being and the Demiurgus, added a third original principle, sometimes the evil spirit, and sometimes matter.[21]

Philosophy was not false but, given the fallen nature of the intellect, it could and often did descend into sophistry in the hands of Jews and heretics, who had already turned their backs on whatever Logos they already possessed and engaged in theological discussions, as a result, "not with any definite ecclesiastical object, but as a mere trial of skill, or as a literary recreation; regardless of the mischief thus done to the simplicity of Christian morals,

and the evil encouragement given to fallacious reasonings."[22] Abandoning the understanding that they were dealing with a mystery, the heretics ignored "the incomprehensibility of the Divine Essence" and tried to catch the Trinity in the net of science by using the "analogy of sense," supposing that "they steered in a safe course, when they avoided every contradiction of a mathematical and material nature."[23]

In the hands of sophists, analogical terms like "son" were taken literally in a way that distorted their meaning when applied to ineffable mystery. Arguments based on physics "were made the basis of discussions upon possibilities and impossibilities in a spiritual substance"[24] and led to conclusions which, no matter how false they were in reality, sounded plausible to an audience which had been raised to respect Greek philosophy, paving the way for the Arian heresy. The logic seemed impeccable, but the result was heresy, or as Epiphanius put it describing the Anomæans: "Aiming to exhibit the Divine Nature by means of Aristotelic syllogisms and geometrical data, they are naturally led on to declare that Christ is not the very Son of God."[25]

An early example of the unfortunate combination of Judaism and Neoplatonism can be found in the writing of Philo of Alexandria (born 25 BC), a Jew who had attempted a synthesis of Greek Philosophy and Judaism in a way which could have proven prophetic but ended up as paradigmatic of later attempts at avoiding the radical implications which the Trinity would pose for both schools of thought. Armed with both the Books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, Philo was ideally situated to create the synthesis that would later undergird Christianity. The material was already there implicitly in the λόγος of Plato, who:

> postulated a demiurge, which "denoted the divine energy in forming the world, (δημιουργός,) or the previous all-perfect incommunicable design of it, (hence called μονογενής,) [and] was arrayed in the attributes of personality, made the instrument of creation, and the revealed image of the incomprehensible God."[26]

Crippled by an obsolete understanding of monotheism, Alexandria's Jews were unable to discern the "*logoi spermatikoi*" adumbrating the Trinity in the logos of Plato, and thwarted the emerging sense of God the Son as one in being with the Father by demoting the Son to the status of a creature. In doing this they prepared the way for Arianism's emergence among the Christian population of Alexandria. As Newman points out, this verdict applies *a fortiori* to Philo, who prepared the way for Arianism by associating his understanding of God "with Platonic notions" which "separated the idea of the Λόγος from that of the eternal God."[27] Following in Philo's footsteps, Antioch's heretical bishop, Paul of Samosata, "denied that the Logos is truly divine."[28] In addition to being bishop, Paul had political connections as well, and owed his fame to Zenobia, Queen of the East, "who is said to have been

a Jewess by birth or creed"[29] and as such "little solicitous for the credit or influence of the Christian Church within her dominions."[30]

Before her involvement with Paul, Zenobia had been on good terms with Emperor Alexander Severus (222-235), who made Syria the center of Imperial syncretism by erecting a chapel in honor of Abraham, Orpheus, Pythagoras, and Christ as "fit emblem of that system."[31] Zenobia's instructor in the Eclectic Philosophy was "the celebrated Longinus," who got his ideas from Plotinus's student Porphyry, who in turn became the inspiration of both Iamblichus and Libanius, as the Eclectic Philosophy which took Plato as its inspiration degenerated into magic under the avid patronage of Julian the Apostate.[32]

Between 263 and 268, Paul had been condemned by three Church councils held in Antioch, but his friendship with Zenobia, Queen of Palmyra, to whom Antioch was then subject, prevented the sentence of deposition from being carried out until 272, when Emperor Aurelian defeated Zenobia and brought Antioch under Roman imperial rule again.[33]

Arianism arose in Antioch because the Jews were strong there, and because the Jews were interested denying the honor due to Christ as the Son of God by thwarting the emerging understanding of the Trinity, which they perceived as an affront to monotheism and, therefore, as weakening their hold over the mind of Judaizing Christians. No matter what their motivation, the Jews were heavily involved in promoting heresy and reaping the political benefits which flowed from Christian disunity. Newman describes Paul of Samosata's early manifestation of the Arian heresy as "a kind of Judaism in doctrine, adopted to please [Zenobia] his Jewish patroness."[34] The heresy of Paul was "not likely to be very systematic or profound" because it was based on "the use of those disputations, and sceptical inquiries, which belonged to the heathen academies . . . scattering up and down the seeds of errors, which sprang up and bore fruit in the generation after him."[35] That very lack of profundity, however, made heretical arguments more plausible than sacred mysteries, which the orthodox would have preferred not to discuss in public. Paul denied the divinity of Christ, not so much out of theological motives, but because he had fallen under the spell of "a judaizing princess," who was "the most illustrious personage of her times," possessing as a result "influence enough among the Christians, to seduce the Metropolitan himself from the orthodox faith."[36] Antioch became the spiritual home of Arianism because Jewish influence led to the relaxation of morals, and that led to a coldness of faith which in turn led to the corrupted state of the Church there.[37] The form which linked the various manifestations of spiritual corruption was Judaism, and the first manifestation of heresy among the Christian population was Judaizing. Even after the intensity of the Arian struggle had abated, St. John Chrysostom's concern about the lingering effect of Judaizing on the Christians of Antioch led him to write *Adversos Judaeos* because, even then, the Jews of Antioch

"manifested a rancorous malevolence towards the zealous champions of the Church" and

> courted the Christian populace by arts adapted to captivate and corrupt the instable and worldly-minded. Their pretensions to magical power gained them credit with the superstitious, to whom they sold amulets for the cure of diseases; their noisy spectacles attracted the curiosity of the idle, who weakened their faith, while they disgraced their profession, by attending the worship of the synagogue.[38]

The Jews began to use music and spectacle to lure unsuspecting Christians into their synagogues, where they weakened their faith and corrupted their morals. The result was disunity, and a Church which comprised

> a mixed multitude, who, without relinquishing their dependence on Christianity for the next world, sought in Judaism the promise of temporal blessings, and a more accommodating rule of life than the gospel revealed. Chrysostom found this evil so urgent at Antioch in his day, as to interrupt his course of homilies on the heresy of the Anomœans, in order to direct his preaching against the seductions to which his hearers were then exposed, by the return of the Jewish festivals.[39]

Seduced by the sensuousness of Jewish rites and especially their use of music, the Christians of Antioch had become accustomed to derogating the honor due to Christ because of their participation in "the carnal self-indulgent religion" of the Jews.[40] When lust darkens the mind, intellectual error follows moral decline. Newman will not go so far as to say that Judaism caused the Arian heresy,

> but it deserves consideration whether a tendency to derogate from the honour due to Christ, was not created by an observance of the Jewish rites, and much more, by that carnal self-indulgent religion, which seems at that time to have prevailed among the rejected nation. When the spirit and morals of a people are materially debased, varieties of doctrinal error spring up, as if self-sown, and are rapidly propagated. While Judaism inculcated a superstitious, or even idolatrous dependence on the mere casualties of daily life, and gave license to the grosser tastes of human nature, it necessarily indisposed the mind for the severe and unexciting mysteries, the large indefinite promises, and the remote sanctions, of the Catholic faith; which fell as cold and offensive on the depraved imagination, as the doctrines of the Divine Unity and of implicit trust in the unseen God, on the minds of the early Israelites.[41]

Seduced by spectacle, Antioch's Christians failed to see that "the obsolete furniture of the Jewish ceremonial"[42] had "a tendency to withdraw the mind from the contemplation of the more glorious and real images of the gospel; so that the Christians of Antioch would diminish their reverence towards the

true Saviour of man in proportion as they trusted to the media of worship, provided for a time by the Mosaic ritual."[43] The sects which arose under Arian influence "retained the pestilence of Jewish unbelief" and "observed the Mosaic Law; and even though they had been influenced by Gnosticism, they entertained Jewish rather than Gnostic conceptions of the Person of Christ."[44] Like Ebion, whose Judaism was "so notorious"[45] that it merited Tertullian's condemnation, Paulus of Samosata held "grossly Humanitarian" doctrinal views which were also "acknowledged to be of Jewish origin." Paul's "ritual Judaism . . . was so notorious, that one author even affirms that he observed the rite of circumcision."[46] Sensing that political gain could accrue from bad theology, the Jews abetted this decline and "sided with the heretical party" in favor of Arianism in all of the popular uprisings which took place in Antioch and Alexandria because "the side of heresy was their natural position."[47] As a result, Christological heresy spread through the Christian congregations of Syria and Egypt. Paul's disciple Lucian picked up his master's Judaizing and used his position as seminary professor to instruct his students Arius and Eusebius, who later became bishop of Nicomedia, in their belief that

> God is One, Eternal, Unbegotten. All other beings are His creatures, the Logos the first of them. Like other creatures the Logos was created from nothing and not from the divine substance (*ousia* in the Greek). There was a time when the Logos did not exist. His creation was not necessary, but due to the will of the Father. The Logos, God's creature, is in turn the creator of all other creatures and his relationship to them is a kind of justification of his being called God. God adopted him as Son foreseeing his merits, for the Logos is free, subject to change and determined to good by his own will. From this adoptive sonship there does not result any real share in the divine nature, any true likeness to it. There cannot be anything like to God. The Holy Spirit is the first of the creatures created by the Logos. He is even less God than the Logos. The Logos became flesh in this sense that in Jesus Christ he took the place of the soul.[48]

In 318 Arius began preaching Lucian's theory in Alexandria, where he acquired a great following among that city's clergy and consecrated virgins by claiming that the Son of God was a creature. According to Sozomen, Arius promoted that idea by introducing "the doctrine of the ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων," claiming that the son was of a substance "that once was not."[49] According to Socrates, Arius proposed the following argument: "1) If the Father begat the Son, He who was begotten has a beginning of existence (ἀρχὴν ὑπάρξεως); 2) therefore once the Son did not exist (ἦν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν); 3) therefore He is formed from what once was not (ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἔχει τὴν ὑπόστασιν)."[50] The formula "ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων," (of a substance that once was not) was so important that the Arians were known as "οἱ ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων, or the Exucontii."[51]

Significant consequences flowed from Arius's argument, the most significant being that Christ was the Logos at God's pleasure and not by birthright. This meant that:

> He only possessed a super-angelic nature, being made at God's good pleasure before the worlds, after the pattern of the attribute Logos or Wisdom, existing in the Divine Mind, gifted with the illumination of it, and in consequence called after it; the instrument of creation and revelation; and at length united to a human body, in the place of its soul, in the person of Jesus Christ. The two heresies also agreed, as the last words imply, in considering the Logos an attribute or manifestation, not a Person. Paulus considered it as if a voice or sound, which comes and goes; so that God may be said to have spoken in Christ.[52]

The Arian position is that Christ "is neither like the Father in substance (ὅμοιος κατ' οὐσίαν), nor is He the true and innate Logos of the Father, nor His true wisdom; but one of His works and creatures."[53] If the Logos were an attribute and not a person, Christ would have no ability to act on his own as the agent of divine providence and the old gap between the uncaused cause and the demiurge would have opened up once again. Deprived of divine providence, the universe became a machine, which is precisely what happened after the founder of modern physics, Isaac Newton, who also happened to be an Arian, denied the divinity of Christ. This disruption led to the pantheism of Spinoza on the one hand, in which individual consciousness disappeared into matter, which became indistinguishable from God, and German idealism, according to which the universe disappeared into consciousness and man's mind became God.[54] Both consequences flowed from a failure to maintain the orthodox position on the Trinity.

Taking the term "Son" in a literal sense which did not apply to God, Arius confused time and causality when he claimed that "He who was begotten has a beginning of existence (ἀρχὴν ὑπάρξεως)." Centuries later Aquinas disentangled time and causality when he said that even if the world were eternal, it would have to come into being, thereby resolving the divisive issues surrounding the eternality of the universe. The orthodox were at a rhetorical disadvantage in Arius's day because all they could affirm when explicating the relation between God the Son and God the Father was its mystery, claiming that Arius had taken the metaphor beyond where it could go. The fact that a father is prior to his son is "implied by the force of the terms as ordinarily used," but when the concept is used to express sacred doctrine, "it is an inference altogether irrelevant," because "the inquiry has reference to that Being, from the notion of whom time as well as space is necessarily excluded."[55] Beyond that, Arius's misappropriation of the metaphors concerning father and son involved him in self-contradiction, because "In the first proposition Arius assumes that He is really a Son, and argues as if He were; in the third, he

has arrived at the conclusion that He is created, i.e. no Son at all, except in a secondary sense, as having received from the Father a sort of adoption."[56] Caught in this contradiction, the Arians responded by claiming that they were being persecuted for being rational when they said: "The Son has an origin (i.e. beginning, ἀρχήν), but God is unoriginate (ἄναρχος); for this, we are under persecution, and for saying, that He is of a substance that once was not (ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων), inasmuch as He is not part of God (μέρος θεοῦ), nor of any previously existing substance. Therefore we are persecuted."[57]

The popularity of Arianism in Antioch could be traced to its appeal to both Greeks and Jews, two groups who found the austere doctrine of the Trinity off-putting for different reasons. Greek sophistry provided the form of argumentation, but the Jewish dependence on Scripture led to an "excessive slavery to the letter"[58] which ignored the contribution which philosophy could make in understanding the mystery of the Trinity. Jewish attachment to a version of *sola scriptura* was both a superstition and "an encroachment on Christian liberty, and an impediment to freedom of thought; and especially unreasonable, considering that a traditionary system of theology, consistent with, but independent of Scripture, had existed in the Church from the Apostolic age."[59] Ignoring the call to the advanced understanding of God's nature which the Gospel of St. John had provided, the Jews retreated to "a Judaical wisdom" wisdom, "poring over syllables while letting slip realities."[60]

Ultimately, the Catholics forced the Arians to admit the contradictory nature of their own conclusions. If Christ were not one in being with the Father, then they were preaching either "a sort of polytheism," in which the Trinity was made up of three gods. Similarly, if Christ were a creature, the Arians were preaching idolatry since he could not, as creature, be the object of proper worship. Neither the "superstition of paganism" nor the "virtual atheism of philosophy"[61] could provide an adequate substitute for the traditional understanding of the Trinity, no matter how inchoate the understanding of that doctrine was at the time. Arius's exposition of Lucian's theory filled his church, but eventually word of that novel theory reached the ears of Alexander, the local bishop, who traced Arius's heresy back to

> Antioch as its original seat, to Judaism as its ultimate source, and to the subtilties of disputation as the instrument of its exhibition; that Arius and his principal supporters were pupils of the school of Antioch; and lastly, that in this school, at the date fixed by Alexander, the above-mentioned elements of the heresy are discovered in alliance, almost in union, with Paulus of Samosata, the judaizing Sophist, being the favourite of a court which patronised Eclecticism, when it was neglected at Alexandria.[62]

By discussing openly the mysteries of the Trinity, the heretics cast pearls before swine, forcing the hand of the orthodox, who would rather not profane

such mysteries by making them the focus of public debate. Alexander accused Arius "of siding with the Jews and heathen against the Church" as well as

> employing women in his disturbance of the Church . . . of his composing and setting to music, songs on the subject of his doctrine for the use of the rudest classes of society, with a view of familiarizing them to it. . . . Such was Arianism at its commencement; and if so indecent in the hands of its originator, who, in spite of his courting the multitude, was distinguished by a certain reserve and loftiness in his personal deportment, much more flagrant was its impiety under the direction of his less refined successors.[63]

Arius first published his heresy about the year 319.[64] Alexander then convoked a council and allowed Arius to state his doctrines freely and to argue in their defense in a way which compounded the confusion by "applauding," as Sozomen tells us, "sometimes the one party, sometimes the other"[65] until his indecision "excited the murmurs of the Catholics." At that point, Alexander discharged his duty by excommunicating Arius and his followers.

Because the bishop had dithered, heresy festered for the following four years. Driven out of Alexandria, Arius found a new home with his old classmate Eusebius, who was now bishop of the imperial city of Nicomedia. Hoping to stem the spread of heresy after the heretic fled his jurisdiction, Alexander wrote more than 70 letters of condemnation, including one to the pope, but Arius nonetheless found a welcome among friends in Nicomedia, where he regrouped his forces by writing "letters, pamphlets, and popular songs embodying his doctrine."[66] Eventually, "all the East was ablaze with the controversy" with "Egypt condemning Arius, [and] the bishops of Asia, led by Eusebius, supporting him."[67]

The only force great enough to resolve the issue was the state, and it was to the Emperor Constantine that the disputants turned after he defeated the Eastern Emperor Licinius and became in 324, at last, sole master of the Roman world and able, as a result, to devote his attention to the theological issue, now known as Arianism, that was having increasingly political consequences.[68] Constantine inaugurated his plan by sending Hosius of Cordova to Alexandria, where he worked out the details of the council with Alexander. Constantine then invited all of the bishops, in his own name, to Nicaea, in Bythnia, not far from Constantinople, providing traveling expenses for all of the bishops attending the council, which opened in June of 325.

Hosius presided; the Bishop of Rome did not attend because of advanced age, but his presence wasn't necessary. After Arius stated his doctrine in all its bald simplicity, the assembled bishops had no choice but to condemn it. The only dispute revolved around agreement on the form the condemnation should take. In the end the Church fathers chose the Greek word "*homoousion*," meaning consubstantial or of the same substance, as the term which best expressed the relationship between the Father and the Son, even though

Paul of Samosata had previously used the same term heretically to say that they were identical in person. The Nicene Creed avoided that error when the council fathers concluded that document by saying that to those who say, "'There was a time when He did not exist; before He was begotten He did not exist; He was made from nothing or from another substance or essence; the Son of God is a created being, changeable, capable of alteration,' to such as these the Catholic Church says Anathema."[69]

The heresy of Arianism should have ended there, and it would have if the Church were merely dealing with a theological issue, but heresy had taken on a political life of its own, largely because of the emperor's attempt to settle theological issues by *force majeure*.

After Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, accused Eusebius of heresy, the Eusebians turned the tables on his accuser and called him a Sabellian. Because Antioch had always been a hotbed of Arianism, Eusebius could mobilize the pro-Arian forces there to depose Eustathius in 331. When the bishop's departure led to rioting, Constantine used the subsequent civil unrest as an excuse to sentence Eustathius to exile, a move which would become the emperor's normal procedure when dealing with bishops deposed by the Arians.

Having secured Antioch to the Arian cause, Eusebius then mounted an attack on the see of Alexandria, which had traditionally been the center of orthodox resistance to the Arian heresy, by attempting to install an Arian bishop as its head, but to do that the Eusebians had to first depose Athanasius, the man who had assisted Alexander at Nicaea and would go on to become the greatest figure in the history of the Arian crisis.

Defeated at the council in 325 and exiled in 327, Eusebius of Nicomedia saw an opportunity to return to power in 328 when Alexander, bishop of Alexandria died on April 17. Athanasius, however, beat him to the punch. Hurrying back to Alexandria after Alexander's death, Athanasius garnered the support of a rump group of that see's 54 divided bishops and got himself consecrated by six or seven of his episcopal supporters at the Church of Dionysius before the majority could reach a decision.[70] His opponents would spend years contesting that consecration, but Eusebius of Nicomedia acted on it immediately, not by contesting it, but by sending Athanasius a letter demanding that he re-install Arius to his former position.

True to his deceased mentor, Athanasius refused, and then the hostilities against him broke out in earnest, led by Eusebius of Nicomedia, who "was ready to move heaven and earth to efface the results" of the Council of Nicaea by attacking its main representative, who was now Bishop of Alexandria. Eusebius began to wage war on those who stood by the *homoousion*, knowing that he could count on the support of the imperial family to purge the hierarchy of orthodox bishops and put Arians in their place. After securing Arius's recall from exile in 330, Eusebius wrote to Athanasius requesting his

re-instatement and threatening dire consequences if Athanasius refused to comply.[71] When Athanasius persisted in his refusal to admit persons convicted of heresy at Nicaea to communion, Eusebius enlisted the help of the emperor, who threatened to depose him if he continued his opposition.

Athanasius replied just as firmly a second time, reaffirming that "the Christ-opposing heresy had no fellowship with the Catholic Church."[72] At this point, his opponents brought relatively trivial charges against him, like claiming that he had been younger than the canonical age when consecrated, which were easily dismissed.

Undeterred by their failure, the Eusebians responded by leveling more serious charges against Athanasius. After bribing Arsenius, the Meletian Bishop of Hypsele, to go into hiding among the Meletian monks of the Thebaid, the Eusebians spread the rumor that Athanasius had had him murdered and, worse still, had procured one of his hands for magical purposes.[73] The Eusebians even circulated a severed hand which they claimed came from the body of the murdered Arsenius as proof of their claim, but they were unable to persuade Constantine to put Athanasius on trial. Athanasius, however, was able to out maneuver his accusers by sending a trusted deacon to the Thebaid, where he located, the supposedly dead, Arsenius alive and well at a Meletian monastery in the nome of Antaeopolis in Upper Egypt. Confronted with his role in the fraud, Arsenius admitted that he had fled his diocese after accepting a large bribe from the Eusebians. Unaware of Athanasius's discovery, the Eusebians put him on trial once again, proffering the severed hand as evidence, but Athanasius outdid them by producing none other than Arsenius himself at first disguised in a cloak. After first proving that the man in question was indisputably Arsenius, Athanasius then asked him to show first one hand and then the other, at which point Athanasius asked his accusers to "point out whence the third hand had been cut off."[74]

Courtroom drama, no matter how impressive, could not save Athanasius, who was eventually driven into exile in Trier, where he lived with a retinue of loyal Egyptians at the residence of the local bishop from 335 to 337. In attempting to depose Athanasius, the Arians picked a fight that they could not win because he "was able, he was learned, he was orthodox. His life was irreproachable. He was to his people a model bishop, and for tenacity of purpose, the inflexibility bred of a clear grasp of principle, no hero of Church History has ever surpassed him."[75] When Athanasius refused to admit Arian heretics to communion at Eusebius's request, Eusebius turned once again for assistance to the emperor, who informed the recalcitrant bishop of Alexandria: "You know my will. Whosoever wishes to re-enter the Church is to be given all facilities. If I hear that you have forbidden to enter anyone who wishes to return, I shall speedily send someone with power to depose you by my order." Undeterred by the emperor's threats, Athanasius, replied that "there can be no

communion between the Catholic Church and a heresy which fights against Christ."[76]

A third attempt to depose Athanasius was thwarted by the faithful of Alexandria, who stood loyally by their bishop. The rioting there was so violent that Arius had to abandon his plan and was summoned to Constantinople instead. After decades of struggle, the bishops who made up the Council of Jerusalem were willing to sacrifice orthodoxy to peace in the Church and decided to override the will of the people and the traditions of the Church by imposing Arius on the see of Constantinople by force, but God intervened in their plans and called Arius from this life in the moment of his greatest triumph. Arius died suddenly in 336 on his way to being installed as bishop of Constantinople, and he was followed in death a few months later by his protector the Emperor Constantine, who died on May 22, 337.

The Arian heresy did not end with the death of its namesake any more than it had ended with the condemnation of its principles at the Council of Nicaea in 325. One year after the death of Arius and his imperial protector, the papacy revived when Pope St. Julius ascended to the chair of Peter in 338. The pope was aided in his efforts to restore orthodoxy by Constans, the emperor of the West, who was as devout in his Catholicism (even to the point of getting baptized) as Constantius II was in his heresy. With Constans' help, Pope Julius was able to re-install Athanasius as bishop of Alexandria, but with Constantine's other successor Constantius II as his supporter, Eusebius was able to defy Church law and install himself as Bishop of Constantinople, ensuring a continuation of hostilities in the Church.

Hostilities returned with another attempt to depose Athanasius. As in the past, Eusebius turned for help to Emperor Constantius, who "sent orders that St. Athanasius was to be expelled, and in his place another enthroned as bishop – Gregory of Cappadocia, a notorious Arian, a lieutenant admittedly of Eusebius."[77] This attempt to install an Arian as Bishop of Alexandria would prove to be Eusebius's last. Eusebius died in 341 leaving a divided Church as his legacy. For nine years, Constans and Pope Julian fought an uphill battle to preserve the rights of the Church in the West against the predations of the Arians, but they were not able to prevent Athanasius from being exiled once again, an expulsion which lasted seven years, ending "in 346, thanks to a sudden change in court favour," after which St. Athanasius was once again allowed to return to Alexandria.

The assassination of Constans on January 18, 350 deprived the Catholics of their imperial champion and left the field open to his one surviving brother, Constantius II, who now became sole emperor of the Roman world and free to impose his Arian sympathies on the Church. Determined to avenge his brother and put down the rebellion his murder had launched, Constantius II broke off his Persian campaign and returned to the West, where he appointed his cousin Gallus Caesar of the East on March 15, 351 at Sirmium. Constantius

then proceded to Antioch, arriving there on May 7. While Constantius was en route to Antioch, the Jews revolted in Palestine.[78] The ringleader was Isaac of Diocesarea, who was aided by Patricius, also known as Natrona, a name that had "messianic connotations."[79] The Jews seemed determined to tread the same path which Simon bar Kochba had trod two centuries before, with ruin once again as its certain outcome. Plagued by the Jewish revolutionary spirit, the Jews looked for a moment of weakness to incite rebellion once again. Jerome writes that the revolt began with a night assault on the Roman garrison, which was destroyed, and allowed the Jews to procure the necessary weapons. According to Sozomen, "The Jews of Diocæsarea also took up arms and invaded Palestine and the neighboring territories, with the design of shaking off the Roman yoke. On hearing of their insurrection, Gallus Caesar, who was then in Antioch, sent troops against them, defeated them, and destroyed Diocæsarea."[80] Again, according to Jerome, Gallus slew thousands of Jewish rebels, including even those who were too young to fight.

Emboldened by the Jews who were their natural allies in the war against Athanasius and the Catholics, the Eusebians were determined to make another attempt to capture Alexandria for Arianism by driving St. Athanasius out for good, even if it meant involving their champion Constantius in three years of civil war. During the same year in which the Bishop Hosius was imprisoned for failing to condemn Athanasius, "the furies of heretical malice were let loose upon the Catholics of Alexandria" when Syrianus, Duke of Egypt, used military force to install George of Cappadocia, "a man of illiterate mind and savage manners," as the Eusebians' substitute for Athanasius as bishop of Alexandria.[81]

On the evening of February 8, 356, as St. Athanasius was presiding at the night office, "and some of our people were keeping vigil, preparatory to receiving the Lord's supper," Syrianus burst into the church "with a force of above 5000 men, prepared for attack, with drawn swords, bows, darts, and clubs, . . . and surrounded the church with close parties of the soldiery, that none might escape from within." According to his first person account of the incident, Athanasius, reluctant to desert his congregation in the midst of the attack, took his seat on the bishop's chair and ordered the deacon to recite Psalm 136, after which they were to retire and go home. Syrianus, however, had something else in mind. Blocking the exits, the Duke of Egypt attempted to arrest Athanasius, at which point:

> the Religious Brethren and some of the clergy, who were immediately about me, ran up the steps, and dragged me down. And so, be truth my witness, though the soldiers blockaded the chancel, and were in motion round about the church, the Lord leading, I made my way through them, and by His protection got away unperceived; glorifying God mightily, that I had been enabled to stand by my people, and even to send them

> out before me, and yet had escaped in safety from the hands of those who sought me.[82]

The document which the Alexandrian Christians presented in protest of the incident gave further details:

> The prayers and sacred reading were proceeding, when they assaulted the doors, and, on these being laid open by the force of numbers, he gave the word of command. Upon which, some began to let fly their arrows, and others to sound a charge; and there was a clashing of weapons, and swords glared against . . . the lamplight. Presently, the sacred virgins were slaughtered, numbers trampled down one over another by the rush of the soldiers, and others killed by arrows. Some of the soldiers betook themselves to pillage, and began to strip the females, to whom the very touch of strangers was more terrible than death. Meanwhile, the Bishop sat on his throne, exhorting all to pray . . . He was dragged down, and almost torn to pieces. He swooned away, and became as dead; we do not know how he got away from them, for they were bent upon killing him.[83]

Athanasius eventually escaped from the church that evening and fled to the wilderness of the Thebaid once again, where he spent the next six years with the Desert Fathers Paul and Anthony, about whom Athanasius would write a book. He resided with the Church's first hermits until the death of Constantius allowed him to return once more to Alexandria.[84] Deprived of the main object of his hatred but armed with Constantius's fulsome recommendation, George of Cappadocia vented his fury on the Catholics of Alexandria, aided by the Jews and heathen of Alexandria, who sympathized with his brutality, "submitted themselves to his guidance, and enabled him to extend the range of his crimes in every direction."[85] George persecuted the Catholics of Alexandria in ways not seen since the days of Diocletian:

> Houses were pillaged, churches were burned, or subjected to the most loathsome profanations, and cemeteries were ransacked. On the week of Whitsuntide, George himself surprised a congregation, which had refused to communicate with him. He brought out some of the consecrated virgins, and threatened them with death by burning, unless they forthwith turned Arians. On perceiving their constancy of purpose, he stripped them of their garments, and beat them so barbarously on the face, that for some time afterwards their features could not be distinguished. . . . This is one out of many notorious facts, publicly declared at the time, and uncontradicted; and which were not merely the unauthorised excesses of an uneducated Cappadocian, but recognised by the Arian body as their own, in a state paper from the Imperial Court, and perpetrated for the maintenance of the peace of the Church, and of a good understanding among all who agreed in the authority of the sacred Scriptures.[86]

With the departure of Athanasius, the entire episcopate fell into the hands of the Arians. Catholics were "completely muzzled and gagged."[87] All joined in the condemnation of Athanasius, who remained the only bishop willing to defend the *homoousion* without reservation. But the orthodox doctrine of *homoousion* had roots so deep that they could not be extirpated by physical violence alone.

Sensing this resistance and not content with handing the see of Alexandria over to "the unauthorized excesses of an uneducated Cappadocian," Constantius convoked another council in Constantinople in 360, at which he used a combination of trickery and physical intimidation to impose a new formula, "*homoiousion*" on the Church. The new formula was distressingly similar to "*homoousion*" to the Latin fathers, who were ignorant of the subtleties of the Greek language. It meant that "the son is not like the father," and it got imposed on the captive bishops. The formula "the son is not like the father" could be affirmed in a non-Arian sense because "To say the Son is of like substance with the Father as a way of denying that He is of the same substance, is of course to deny Nicaea. But to make the assertion in opposition to the Anomoean teaching – that the Son is not like to the Father – is to use *homoiousion* in an orthodox sense." The Anomoeans, who claimed that "the οὐσία of the Son was unlike, ἀνόμοιος, the Divine οὐσία," claimed that their new formula avoided the misunderstandings which the Nicene term "*homoousion*" had created, but in doing this they took advantage of the "rude Occidentals" ignorance of Greek subtlety and tricked their naïve western colleagues into rushing "from orthodoxy into the most hard and undisguised impiety."[88] The Latins had barely left Constantinople when Valens informed the Latin bishops that, no matter what their intention had been, they had repudiated the Nicene Creed by endorsing the "*homoiousion*." By affirming that the Logos was "not a creature like others," the Latin fathers had affirmed, to their astonishment, that he was a creature like others, the very doctrine the Nicene fathers had condemned.[89]

When the fathers of the Council of Constantinople published the protocol of their defection in January 361, St. Jerome was moved famously to exclaim: "The whole world groaned to find itself Arian."[90] Arianism, however, collapsed at its moment of triumph. In May of 360, five months after the conclusion of the Council at Constantinople, Constantius's cousin Julian, hitherto ruling Gaul as Caesar, was proclaimed Emperor of the West by the acclamation of his troops in Paris. This treason precipitated yet another civil war, which Constantius most probably would have won had he not died suddenly en route to his first battle with Julian.

The West was soon delivered from Arian control. Eighteen months after the Council of Constantinople and shortly after the death of Constantius, his nephew Julian, later known as the Apostate, became sole emperor of the Roman Empire, a mere six years after having been sent into exile in Gaul.

Persecution of a different sort would follow, but not at the hands of the Arian heretics, who lost their political influence as Julian, who was a pupil of Eusebius of Nicomedia, pushed the re-introduction of paganism as the empire's official religion. In the meantime, Eclectic philosophy became "the authorised interpretation and apology for the state polytheism."[91] Julian initially paid lip service to the Church, extolling its zeal and its brotherly love, beneficence and wise discipline, but trouble followed when he attempted:

> to restore the Christian doctrine of the Trinity to its ancient and pure Platonic basis. It followed as a natural consequence, that the claims of religion being no longer combined, defined, and embodied in a personal Mediator between God and man, its various precepts were dissipated back again and confused in the mass of human knowledge, as before Christ came; and in its stead a mere intellectual literature arose in the Eclectic school, and usurped the theological chair as an interpreter of sacred duties, and the instructor of the inquiring mind. "In the religion which he (Julian) had adopted," says Gibbon, "piety and learning were almost synonymous; and a crowd of poets, of rhetoricians, and of philosophers, hastened to the Imperial Court, to occupy the vacant places of the bishops, who had seduced the credulity of Constantius."[92]

As in 337, an unexpected change of ruler delivered the Catholics, in the very moment when their cause seemed utterly and for ever lost.[93] After becoming emperor, Julian initiated a policy of toleration which entailed recalling the bishops whom Constantius had banished, not to restore Catholicism but to spread disunity. Newman claims that Julian "invited to his palace the leaders of the hostile sects, that he might enjoy the agreeable spectacle of their furious encounters."[94] The schism in Antioch, however, was not terminated until the time of Chrysostom.[95] When the Council of Constantinople met in 381, Arianism was a dead issue, not so much because of the actions of the bishops, who were hopelessly divided on the issue, as through the actions of Julian the Apostate, the sworn enemy of the Church, who brought about God's will in spite of his intending to destroy the Church. Julian's intent may have been malicious, but he did "contribute to the ascendancy of the right faith"[96] as an example of what Hegel would have called the cunning of reason.

Chapter Three

Julian the Apostate and the Doomed Temple

It is one of the ironies of history that Flavius Claudius Julianus, the Roman emperor who was the scion of the dynasty that acknowledged Christianity as the religion of Rome, should come to be known to us as Julian the Apostate. Born in 331, Julian was raised a Christian, but watching his relatives get slaughtered by nominally Christian relatives soured him on Christianity. He never knew Basilina, his mother, who died within months of his birth. His father was a distant figure, caught up in the administration of the empire, who had Julian raised by servants until his father was murdered by Constantius II, Julian's cousin and Constantine's successor. Ricciotti says Julian "seems never to have fully recovered from this tragic shock which influenced many of his decisions in later life."[1]

When Constantine the Great died on May 22, 337, Constantius II resolved any doubts about imperial succession by brute force, murdering his rivals. In his *Life of Constantine*, Eusebius of Caesarea claims "the slaughters had their origin in a spontaneous decision of the soldiers throughout the empire,"[2] but St. Jerome, St. Athanasius, and Zosimus agreed with Julian, who held Constantius II responsible. Julian escaped death because of his age—he was six years old when Constantine died—but later gave full expression to the feeling he nurtured throughout his life: "And what this most beneficent emperor did for us who were so closely related to him! Six of our common cousins, his uncle, my father, and another on our father's side, and my eldest brother, he put to death without a trial. My other brothers and I, whom he had intended to kill, were eventually sent into exile."[3]

Because Julian held Constantius II responsible for the murder of his relatives, his hatred gradually transformed itself into a overwhelming desire for revenge against Constantius II and his religion, Christianity. Julian also lost his inherited property, which passed to Constantius II, his Christian—albeit Arian—cousin. (Constantius II, whose reign saw a resurgence of the Arian heresy, was Christian by self-designation only. Like Constantine, he put off baptism until his death bed.) Julian hated Christianity "not by any

philosophic or abstract reason but by the fact that his murderous cousin was a Christian."[4] His revulsion would grow with time.

Constantius II sent Julian to Nicomedia for education, where he was taught by Mardonius, his mother's former tutor. Julian learned the poetry of Homer and Hesiod as well as the philosophy of Plato, Socrates, Aristotle, and Theophrastus. Julian must have received instruction in Christianity there too.

Mardonius accompanied Julian to Macellum, where Julian was baptized and where he and his brother were enrolled in the Christian clergy in the minor order of lector. Julian read the Scriptures in the assemblies. At Macellum, Julian learned the habit of duplicity that remained with him for his entire life. Although baptized, in Macellum Julian also fell under the influence of Maximus of Ephesus and became convinced the ancient gods had anointed him to restore the empire to the glory it knew under paganism.

Scholars have concluded that Mardonius was an "honest pagan."[5] Julian's later pagan teachers were more dubious. Mardonius led Julian to the threshold of the sacred temple of Neoplatonic philosophy, which had become hopelessly infected with magic and the occult. If Mardonius was Julian's Vergil, Maximus of Ephesus was the temptress Beatrice who led him across the threshold into the occult. Maximus "initiated" Julian into theurgy. Under the influence of Maximus and other adepts in secret Gnosis, Julian became convinced the wisdom of the Greeks would triumph over the folly of Constantine. There was no reason why one of Constantine's relatives or successors should not come to his senses and restore Hellenism. Those in Constantinople who thought as he did soon saw in Julian their secret champion, even though Julian must have taken part in Christian services there.

At the end of 351, Constantius II ordered Julian to return to Nicomedia, but forbade him to attend the lectures of Libanius. Julian obeyed his cousin externally, but duplicitously followed them closely in secret by poring over notes taken by others. The return to Nicomedia marked "the beginning of Libanius' influence over Julian, an influence which was to increase continually until the Apostate's death."[6] Ricciotti refers to Libanius as "a rhetorician . . . without depth of thought; in other words, a brilliant literary peacock."[7] Libanius, who later became teacher of St. John Chrysostom, hated Christianity as an intellectually feeble alternative to the Hellenic tradition, which boasted a pantheon of literary gods from Homer to Plato.

When Julian came under Libanius' spell, however, Plato's teaching and philosophy had fallen on hard times. Hellenism meant Neoplatonism, a compendium based on Plato's teachings as synthesized by Plotinus a century before but split apart again by Plotinus' students Porphyry and Iamblichus.

Porphyry was a practitioner of magic and theurgy who, under the influence of Plotinus, rejected occultism in favor of reason and philosophy according to the traditional understanding of Plato's teachings. The same cannot be said of Iamblichus. As Neoplatonism's center of gravity shifted toward Asia

at the beginning of the fourth-century, magic gained the upper hand over philosophy. Iamblichus was Neoplatonism's representative, leading the final decline of the Hellenism of Plato into the mumbo-jumbo of Asiatic magic. So

> The exponents of this late Neoplatonism thus gradually ceased to be philosophers, since they renounced the hope of arriving at divine contemplation by means of reason and became instead to a greater or less extent hierophants, magicians, thaumaturges, and evokers of the gods [who] dedicated themselves to the task of bringing that divinity to light [through] "theurgy," that is, divine work.[8]

The decay of Platonic thought eventually infected Judaism. Cabala was the Neoplatonic reading of the Talmud, and the Lurianic Cabala would become Talmudic Judaism infected with Iamblichus' version of Neoplatonic thaumaturgy, according to which the thaumaturge tried to rescue the scattered sparks and bring about *Tikkun Olam*, or the healing of the world. But that is to get ahead of our story.

Julian, who would live only to 32, was fully formed in his beliefs at 20. By then Julian renounced Christ in favor of Mithra, and in keeping with his dualistic nature, kept his true beliefs secret until the proper time to reveal them. In the meantime, he attended church, especially on religious feast days, while practicing his real religion in secret.

St. Gregory Nazianzen, who met Julian in Athens, felt that he was "handicapped by a number of physical and moral defects" mirrored in his appearance.[9] Julian was short, stocky and bearded. Ammanius, his pagan biographer, claims "the rabble at Antioch called him a Cercops (one of a race changed by Jupiter into apes), since being of low stature and having a beard like a billy goat's he spread his broad shoulders as he advanced with great strides through the streets."[10] Gregory felt that Julian went to Athens "to associate secretly with pagan priests and quacks, since he was not yet confirmed in his impiety."[11] His duplicitous nature was expressed in Julian's "weaving head [and] shifty feet [and] the constant changes of opinion without apparent reason"; his religious fanaticism was expressed in "the wild, wandering eyes. . . the nostrils breathing hate and scorn, the proud and contemptuous lineaments of the face, the paroxysms of uncontrolled laughter . . . the breathless speech and disordered, senseless questions, interlaced with answers no more to the point." Gregory wondered, "What a monster the Roman empire is nourishing within itself!"[12]

Julian visited Pergamum, then an important center for Hellenism. There Maximus of Ephesus tightened his control over Julian's mind. Iamblichus was no longer at Pergamum, but his spirit perdured through the work of his disciples, Aedisius and Maximus. Julian had the reputation of being an ascetic, but intellectually, he showed little discipline much less asceticism. Warned by Eusebius to pursue "the purification of the soul through the use of reason,"

Julian chose instead the meretricious thaumaturgy Eusebius condemned. Maximus, "completely dedicated to the occult sciences and theurgy,"[14] invited Eusebius and Julian to a magic show at the temple of Hecate that featured the spontaneous lighting of torches and other wonders. Julian was swept away by the spectacle. "Farewell to your books, you have shown me my man," Julian said, confounding Eusebius' admonition.[15]

Julian stayed on for a course in magic, during which he was initiated into theurgic mysteries, which Gregory Nazianzen describes thus:

> Julian descended into a subterranean sanctuary closed to the common people in the company of a clever conjurer, a theosophist rather than a philosopher. Such individuals practiced a kind of divination that required darkness and subterranean demons to foretell the future. As Julian advanced farther and farther, he encountered terrors increasingly numerous and alarming—strange sounds, revolting exhalations, fiery apparitions, and other such prodigies. Since he was taking his first steps in the occult science, the strangeness of the apparitions terrified him. He made the sign of the Cross. The demons were subdued and all the visions disappeared. Julian regained courage and began to advance. Then the dread objects began to reappear. The sign of the Cross was repeated and they again disappeared. Julian wavered. The director of the initiation at his side explained: "We loathe but no longer fear them. The weaker cause has conquered!" Convinced by these words, Julian was led on toward the abyss of perdition. What he later heard and did only those know who have undergone such initiations. At any rate, from that day he was possessed.[16]

Like Keith Richards, the Rolling Stones' guitarist at the 1969 rock concert that returned human sacrifice to the realm of public spectacle, Julian made the sign of the Cross when demons were about to overwhelm him, until he realized at the prompting of his guide that he was there to be overwhelmed by the demons he feared. The Greek gods were real enough: the Christians called them demons or fallen angels. From then, Julian was their servant. At their behest he rose to the pinnacle of power in the Roman empire and then to doom in the deserts of what is now Iraq. Julian's career is inexplicable without consideration of his recourse to these gods. He saw them at his side during crises, and he consulted them in the entrails of animals and the flight of birds at every turn; they advised him at crucial moments.

In 355 Julian received permission to study at the School of Athens. The Athenians were described in Acts 17:21 as people who "employed themselves in nothing else but in telling or in hearing some new thing." Only the level of Athenian decadence had changed since the time of St. Paul. When Julian arrived, Athenians were living on the memories of the glorious past, but they did not measure up to that past. They talked about Plato, but they substituted

theurgy for his teaching. In a stronger soul, their decadence would have inspired disgust; in Julian, it confirmed his abandonment of philosophy for magic. Julian encouraged his pagan followers by submitting to initiation into the Eleusinian mysteries in ceremonies so secret that almost nothing is known of them.

Judged by its effect, the magic seemed powerful enough. After leaving Athens, Julian was summoned to Milan, where he was crowned Caesar in November, 355. One month later, he was sent to rule Gaul. Julian was 23 years old and had spent his life immersed in books and conversing with those who possessed esoteric knowledge.

Gaul was a province in ruin. Colonia Agrippina (Cologne) the principal city of Germania Secunda had just fallen to barbarian invaders. The barbarian tribes had established a base of operations that extended 35 miles west of the Rhine, from which they could pillage Roman Gaul at will. The barbarians controlled the west bank of the Rhine all the way to the North Sea, effectively cutting off ship traffic up the Rhine, preventing support from or to Britain. To make matters worse, Constantius II had made Julian a puppet Caesar answerable to generals already in Gaul, whose negligence and corruption had created the chaos.

Facing great handicaps, Julian learned to be a ruler and a general in a few months. Within a short time, he reformed the corrupt tax system of the bankrupt Gallic prefecture. Then, securing the goods to prosecute a campaign against the barbarians, he defeated Chonodomarius and 30,000 Alamanni in a battle near Strasbourg. After the victory, Julian's legions acclaimed him Augustus, or sole ruler of the empire, but he declined the honor.

Julian had taken on the superhuman characteristics of the gods he worshipped. A Mars in battle, he was a Zeus in rule. He drove the barbarians across the Rhine and freed Gaul from imminent danger. His skill as an administrator won him the esteem even of his Christian enemies like Sts. Ambrose and Gregory Nazianzen. As governor of Gaul, "he succeeded in reducing the *captatio* from 25 to only seven aurei per head"[17] while providing sustenance for successful military campaigns. He was renowned for the purity of his morals. Ammanius, his pagan biographer, claims "He was so conspicuous for his undefiled chastity that after the death of his wife [Helena] it is well known that he never gave a thought to love. . . . Even his most confidential servants never accused him of any suspicion of lustfulness, as often happens."[18] In 359 he took the war against the Alamanni to the heart of their territory, attacking them on their side of the Rhine.

Achievement like this could not go unpunished. Constantius II stripped Julian of the better half of his troops and ordered them to the eastern front where they were to fight under Constantius II against the Persians. The fame of the Gallic troops, who it was said never turned their back on the enemy, preceded them eastward, but they refused to return the compliment. After one

detachment left, the rest mutinied, refusing to leave Julian, whom they again declared Augustus. This time Julian consulted the gods before responding. "I prayed to Zeus," he wrote, "through an opening in the wall" of his quarters in Paris.[19] "I entreated the god to give me a sign, and thereupon he showed to me and ordered me to yield and not to oppose the will of the army."[20] The *genius publicus* of the empire appeared to him in his sleep and rebuked him for his timidity. "If I am not received even now," the guardian spirit of the empire told Julian, "when many men share my opinion, I shall depart sad and dejected."[21] In the morning, Julian, who "told his more intimate friends about the vision," according to Ammanius, yielded to the demands of his troops, who raised him on a military shield and proclaimed him Augustus, sole ruler of the Roman Empire.[22]

Julian, like Caesar before him, cast his die and crossed his Rubicon. He consoled himself against the reproach that he was a traitor, a usurper, and ungrateful to his cousin who had elevated him to Caesar by the "mystic conviction that he had been chosen by the gods to renew their worship."[23] Eunapius writes that Julian "after his conquest of Gaul. . . summoned the heirophant from Greece, and after he had performed with his assistance certain rites known to themselves alone, he was aroused to throw off the tyranny of Constantius II."[24] His decision to rebel against his cousin was a function of his involvement in the occult; the sense of political destiny it instilled in him pushed Julian to rebel.

Summoning his troops, who had mutinied at the thought of leaving Gaul, Julian marched east and then embarked on the Danube, sailing forth to his rendezvous point in what is now Serbia. During his progress down the Danube, "the people flocked together at his passage—the Romans on the right bank to acclaim him and the barbarians on the left to gaze on him in wonder and to bend their knees in terror."[25] Cooler heads thought he was sailing toward his doom. With rebellion behind him and Constantius II's army massing in front of him on the plains of Illyricum, Julian "was headed toward disaster"[26] when the gods intervened in his life once again. Constantius II suddenly died on November 3, 361 on his way to do battle. Julian took Constantius II's sudden death as proof of the gods' approval of the rebellion. Julian entered Constantinople on December 11. The court confirmed him sole Augustus because "the times required an energetic and warlike leader."[27]

Julian was at the pinnacle of power and in a position to effectuate the commission for which the gods prepared him, the restoration of pagan worship throughout the empire. "I came because the gods expressly bade me, and promised me safety if I obeyed them, but they threatened me with what I pray no god may do to me if I stayed."[28]

After his accession to the imperial throne, Julian announced he had ceased being a Christian at the age of 20 and that he was anointed by Rome's ancient gods to restore her former glory. Socrates and Sozomen trace Julian's apostasy

and moral fall to the machinations of the theurgist Maximus of Ephesus, and Ricciotti writes, "considering the moral character of the theurgists, this is quite probable."[29] Socrates, Sozomen and Gregory Nazianzen, he continues, "all affirm that at this time Julian kept up the appearance of being a Christian."[30] Nevertheless, his withdrawal from Christianity in the secret of his conscience was compete and definitive. He confesses in a letter at the end of 362 that he had "walked along the road" of the Christians "till his twentieth year," but that "with the help of the gods" he had walked along another "for twelve years."[31] The chief obstacle to restoring paganism was Christianity, which had received numerous benefactions from the state since the Edict of Milan in 313.

Julian was a determined reactionary. To purify himself from baptism, which he heard left an invisible but permanent sign on those who received it, he submitted to the Mithraic sacrament known as the taurobolium. Crouching naked in a trench, the most powerful man on earth allowed the blood of a slaughtered bull to pour over his entire body, but particularly those members most in need of purification: his hands which had handled the body of Christ in the Eucharist. Gregory Nazianzen writes Julian "washed his hands, purifying them from the unbloody sacrifice through which we become partakers in the sufferings and divinity of Christ."[32]

The Petulantes and Celts, his loyal legions from Gaul, busily went from one drunken orgy to another, gorging themselves on the meat of slaughtered animals to propitiate the rehabilitated gods. Cynics began referring to Julian Augustus as "the butcher," conjuring up images of him covered with blood hacking away at sides of beef as his new priesthood of libertines and whores looked on in cynical amusement.[33]

Julian was a classic reactionary. He was determined to restore the worship of the gods, convinced they had led him through the extraordinary events of his life for that purpose. When he became Augustus, "he laid bare the secrets of his heart and with plain and final decrees ordered the temples to be opened, victims to be brought to the altars and the worship of the gods to be restored."[34]

But Julian was thoroughly modern too, which is to say, masonic in his duplicity. He promoted the goals of his esoteric circle of thaumaturges under the exoteric guise of religious tolerance. He intended, at least he said in public, "to grant full religious liberty not only to the pagans but also to the Christians."[35] Ammanius, part of his inner circle, understood the meaning of the gesture. Julian granted universal freedom of conscience "that he might have no fear thereafter of a united populace, because such a freedom increased their dissensions, and he knew from experience that no wild beasts are so hostile to mankind as are most Christians in their savage hatred for one another."[36] Trying to "divide and conquer," Julian hoped to reduce Christianity "to extremes without appearing as an open adversary."

Julian inaugurated a thoroughly modern persecution in which the state seemed a benevolent supporter of tolerance when it was encouraging pagans to attack Christians with impunity. It was like Sargent Shriver giving $900,000 to the Blackstone Rangers in Chicago in the '60s. Certain groups had free rein to terrorize Christians because they enjoyed the favor of the emperor and would never be punished. Ricciotti calls it "disguised persecution guided by the hand in power."[37] He says "Julian shrank from the death sentence, since this would have removed the disguise from his system of veiled persecution."[38]

Julian was ahead of his times. He invented *Kulturkampf* a millenium and a half before Bismarck fired Catholic teachers from the Gymnasium in Braunsberg. Julian, like Bismarck, felt "Christians should be discredited by being deprived of their culture."[39] Julian banned Christian teachers from schools, but made it seem he was implementing a politically neutral program of educational reform. In June 362, Julian issued the constitution *Magistros studiorum* which gives the "appearance of neutrality,"[40] because the "words of the decree, taken alone, could not be interpreted as a direct plot against any individuals or groups within the empire such as the Christians."[41] But the exoteric document was interpreted in light of a circular letter to the esoteric circle of magistrates and teachers who implemented the constitution. Again

> it is necessary to keep in mind that Julian was a member of the secret society of Mithra . . . and that in such associations it was the rule to reveal only the more generic and vague aspects of one's thoughts, keeping hidden what ever was more characteristic and decisive. We obviously have an example of this procedure here: Julian's generic plan was set forth in the *Magistros studiorum*, but its specific interpretation was reserved for the letter already cited.[42]

By depriving Christians of their culture, Julian rendered them powerless without the odium of bloody persecution. In this he was a typically modern ruler. He was a radical innovator who dramatically expanded the power of the state into spheres traditionally left to the family. When Rome was a republic, the state bowed to the *paterfamilias* in education. In *De republica* Cicero claimed Romans "had never wished for any system of education for free-born youths that was either definitely fixed by law or officially established or uniform for all."[43] Even in Hadrian's time, education was a private initiative. But the situation changed as the government subsidized the schools. The *quid pro quo* was to become common in other empires, too: Financial support in exchange for the schools' allegiance to the regime. "Vespasian," Ricciotti says, "was the first to assign to rhetoricians an annual salary of 100,000 sesterces from the public treasury."[44] Christian teachers had to renounce their faith or give up their careers and face poverty and social ostracism. "There was to be no bloody persecution," Ricciotti continues, "but rather a slow asphyxiation and inevitable paralysis."[45]

In one of the ironies that mark Julian's career, he articulated a position the Church would eventually take with regard to the Jews. "I do not want the Galileans to be put to death or unjustly beaten or to suffer anything else," Julian told his teachers and magistrates, "but still I emphatically maintain that those who reverence the gods must be preferred to them."[46] Under the formula "*Sicut Judaeis non,*" Pope St. Gregory the Great articulated the same principle as the Church's policy toward the Jews. No one was to harm them, but they were to be given no position of cultural influence, lest they use it to engage in blasphemy and the corruption of morals.

Mesmerized by Maximus of Ephesus, whom Ricciotti compares to "a mysterious sphinx charming him from afar,"[47] Julian was drawn to ruin in the deserts of the East, but before that he succumbed to a vision of himself as the pagan messiah, a vision confected by the thaumaturges and hierophants who surrounded him. The man who studied Greek literature so avidly seemed strangely unaware of the hubris that ruled his life. Messianic politics broke out where least expected, from the very empire that crushed it among the Jews three centuries earlier:

> Just as the Messianic herald had been chosen to bring back to Jahweh all the offspring of Israel and to carry the message of salvation "even to the farthest part of the earth," so Julian would bring back all the peoples of the empire who were corrupted by the Christianity of Constantine to the worship of the gods.

Ricciotti says "this pagan messianic program" wasn't "exclusively religious in the modern sense of the word, since it also involved politics as well."[48] But it was precisely messianic politics because it mixed religion, politics, and a charismatic penchant for private revelations as the validator of preconceived policies. In this, Julian was a forerunner of George W. Bush. Both led their empires into ill-fated military campaigns against rulers of Mesopotamia; both relied more on gut feeling than rational calculation; both were influenced by the traditional source of messianic politics, namely, the Jews—George Bush by his neoconservative advisers; Julian through the study of literature, in particular the Church fathers and their polemics against the Jews.

Julian initially espoused tolerance to all religious sects to sow dissension in the hope they would eradicate each other, saving him the trouble. His policy toward the Jews was dictated by the same principle. Julian felt the religion of the Jews was, except for its unfortunate penchant for monotheism, almost as good as the religion of the Hellenes. Julian was sympathetic to the Jews, probably because of their antipathy toward Christians, and decided to exploit it for political effect.

Although originally viewed by Rome as a sect of Judaism, Christianity became Judaism's bitterest rival after the destruction of the Temple in 70 AD and the bar Kokhba rebellion in 131. In Antioch, where Julian was despised by

Christians and ridiculed by pagans, he was described as a hairy ape with the beard of a he-goat who was always buried in books. Since he was avid to refute Christianity, Julian was especially familiar with Christian texts and Christian writers. From them, he knew Jews were the main opponents of Christianity; Jews were also involved in every persecution. So he decided to use them to refute Christianity once and for all. Aware of the theological import of Matt 24:2, in which Christ prophesied the destruction of the Temple, Julian decided to reverse history by rebuilding the temple that Christ said would remain forever destroyed. "The high priest of the Hellenes would embarrass the god of the Galileans on his own terrain, making Him out to be a charlatan."[49]

In *Against the Galileans*, now known only through writings of those who wrote to refute it, Julian accused the Christians of impiety, of atheism, of claiming that men were not divine, and of being the illegitimate offspring of Judaism. Judaism was more legitimate because it was ancient. Christianity had existed for only 300 years, and no one in his right mind could put faith in a religion that new. The dispute over the relative antiquity of the religions bespoke a deeper dispute: the issue of patrimony and lineage. The dispute between the Jews who accepted Christ as the Messiah and those who rejected him became full-blown cultural warfare within years of Christ's crucifixion. Who were the true children of Abraham and Moses? Which was the True Israel? An astute politician, Julian would have his enemies fight each other to settle the claim. Since Christianity was the established religion, that meant promoting the cause of the Jews, the Christians' implacable enemy.

The Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles describe the founding of the Church as a life and death struggle with the Jews, who, even more than the pagan Romans, saw it as a threat precisely because it refused to see itself as new. The followers of Christ were one religion among many in the Roman empire because they lacked political power, but they could not accept the Jews as one of those many religions. The Jews, many Christian writers made clear, were different from the Hebrews. The Hebrew religion had a priesthood, a Temple, and sacrifice. After 70 AD, the Jews had none of these things, so the religion of the Jews could not be the same as that of the Hebrews. The only religion that had a priesthood, a Temple, and a sacrifice was the Catholic Church, the New Israel. The Jews did not have a separate but equal covenant; the only real basis for fulfilling their covenant had been destroyed.

Writing about 115 AD, St. Ignatius of Antioch claimed "It is absurd to have Jesus Christ on the lips, and at the same time to live like a Jew." He established the proper causal and chronological relationship between Judaism and Christianity: "Christianity did not believe in Judaism," he tells us, "but Judaism believed in Christianity, and in its bosom was assembled everyone professing faith in God."[50] The Hebrew prophets, he wrote, "lived a Christian life," because they lived "a life in union with Christ even before he came."[51]

Logically then, the religion called Judaism after Christ was a spurious invention lacking continuity with Abraham and Moses.

Writing in the aftermath of the bar Kokhba rebellion, St. Justin Martyr makes the point more emphatically. Justin refers to the Old Testament as "our writings" because, though delivered to the Jews, they were destined for the Christians.[52] The Jews are incapable of understanding Scripture because they are "carnal," a word applied to them repeatedly by the Church fathers. Because they did not understand the Scriptures, the Jews rejected Christ and attacked him when he walked among them. Similarly, they also attack Christians because they do not understand the real or spiritual meaning of Scripture.

Political messianism is a manifestation of the carnal Jew. According to the Church Fathers, the Jews perennially await a messiah who will restore their political power. Christianity is incompatible with political messianism and Jewish revolutionary activity because it recognizes another messiah. According to Justin Martyr, who died roughly 50 years after Ignatius, Christians were persecuted during the bar Kokhba rebellion because of their loyalty to Jesus Christ. Eusebius says bar Kokhba persecuted the Christians because they would not fight the Romans, because that would mean accepting bar Kokhba as their messiah. Jewish revolutionary fervor only increased Jewish hatred of Christianity because they saw the Christians as traitors.

Justin writes "Not only do the Jews hate the Christians, but they persecute them, and treat them like the pagans do, as worthy of punishment and of death, whenever they can put their plans into execution."[53] Rejection of the true Messiah made them intolerant of those who questioned their messianic politics, namely, the Christians, who chided them for their folly and blindness. Add the dispute over which was the True Israel, and constant friction and bloodshed resulted. When Christians claimed for themselves the antiquity of the Jews, this reproach "struck at the very roots of Jewish self-respect" because in antiquity "the proof of late origin meant that historically the people with this late origin was of little importance. Such a people received its culture from other peoples."[54] The question perdured through polemics: who had the derivative culture? The Christians or the Jews?

Justin Martyr addressed the issue in his *Dialogue with Trypho*, written in the aftermath of the bar Kokhba rebellion. The dialogue was "written. . . for those Jews brought up with some of the benefits of Greek training, but faithful to the Law" who were "disillusioned at the temporal collapse of Judaism in the days of their parents."[55] Justin felt that the Jewish people were held in intellectual and spiritual bondage by their rabbis, so "it was against their authority and their competence that he leveled his attack."[56] *Dialogue with Trypho* is aimed at Jews during their moment of disillusionment flowing from the ruined hope in a false messiah. Justin could not set up a straw Judaism; his audience would see through any caricature. Harnack comments: Justin is

"a reliable reporter and does not construct a Judaism that will suit his own polemical purposes."[57] The *Dialogue* is, Wilde says, "*necessarily* a substantially faithful representation of Jewish religious life in the middle of the second century from the point of view of a Christian and with the reactions of a Christian."[58] It "shows us that the two religions are completely separated from one another." Wilde describes the *Dialogue* as "the monologue of the victor."[59]

Justin concedes to Rabbi Trypho that Christians and Jews worship the same God. But differences outweigh similarities. Trypho concedes the messiah, according to Scripture, must suffer, but pulls back in disgust at the idea he would suffer and die in the shameful manner recounted in the Gospels. The Cross was a scandal to the Jews of St. Paul's time and to the Jews of Trypho's. Trypho, like Maimonides 1000 years later and virtually every rabbi in between, wanted a messiah "who would be great and glorious."

Justin realized the Jewish desire for a carnal messiah was undimmed by the disastrous bar Kokhba rebellion.[60] Because the Jews were not going to embrace Christ, Justin argued for concessions in behavior so the two groups could live in peace under Roman rule. Justin called for an end to reviling Christ in the synagogue, a common practice based on the Talmud. He also said only a Jew would claim the crucifixion was necessary so there was no guilt on their part (in contrast to what St. Paul says at Romans 3:5-8). At the end of his *Dialogue*, his Jewish interlocutors remain unconvinced and unconverted. This obdurate blindness, he suggests, will last for a long time.

The *Dialogue* is not irenic in the sense those living in the wake of Vatican II have grown accustomed to. Justin reviles Jews for "blind obedience to rabbinic control." Only in Christianity can Jews find "the fulfillment of their messianic expectations, the explanation of the collapse of Judaism, and the freedom which their spirits craved and which their condition denied them."[61] The rejection of Christ orchestrated by the rabbis turned Judaism into anti-Christianity, distorting the Jewish personality. The Jews "are openly wicked men." They are "worse than the Ninevites who at least did penance, for they by their bad actions make the pagans calumniate God. By their merely carnal understanding of the Law, designed to be primarily spiritual; they make men calumniate the law and hence the God of the Law and are thus false to their spiritual vocation." The Jews are "wise only in doing evil" and, as a result, "unable to know the hidden plan of God."[62]

The most obvious manifestation of Jewish wickedness is the persecution of Christians, which follows logically from the Jews' responsibility for the death of Christ. Justin is not alone in ascribing to Jews the role of persecutor.

The Martyrdom of Polycarp illustrates the extent of Jewish participation in the persecution of Christians. Polycarp was bishop of Smyrna when a persecution of Christians broke out. In Revelation 2:8 the Jews in Smyrna are described as forming the synagogue of Satan, a group habitually slandering and persecuting Christians. When the persecution commenced, Polycarp

escaped. Captured later with others, they were burned alive rather than renounce their faith; the whole populace gathered wood, but "especially active in these preparations were the Jews, as was their custom, who eagerly helped people in this matter." In ascribing blame for the murder of Polycarp, the author mentions that this sort of persecution was "habitually practiced by the Jews."[63]

Origen says Jews were habitual inciters of widespread and long-standing persecution of Christians. The persecutions were too systematic to be local or personal. They were the policy of the rabbis who controlled Jewish life. Origen mentions that the Jews roused local populations to persecute Christians by repeated calumnies. The Jewish claim that Christians ate murdered infants at night meetings was a calumny that triggered one persecution, but he says the history of Jewish persecution went back to apostolic times. In 62, the apostle James was thrown to his death from the Temple. From 131-135, Simon bar Kokhba gave Christians the choice of apostasy or death. Women were whipped or stoned if they showed any intention of becoming Christians. "Opposition at all times," Wilde writes, summing up Origen, "and persecution where possible, was the policy of the Jews, once the distinction between Jews and Christians became known and understood."[64] Like other Church Fathers, Origen felt Jewish opposition to Christianity flowed from Jewish opposition to Christ; their hatred of Christ stemmed from their carnal nature and "national pride" because Christianity admitted Gentiles into the new spiritual kingdom.[65] According to Rabbi Tarphon (perhaps the model for the Rabbi in Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho*), Christians "were far worse than the pagans, for the pagans never had the truth. But the Minim [the Christians] had the truth and abandoned it. Hence we find the curse upon the Minim introduced into the Shemone Esre at the end of the first-century or the beginning of the second."[66]

The evidence for Jewish animus against Christians is not ascribable to unfortunate personal experience. It suffuses the patristic writings, just as it suffuses the canonical books of the New Testament.[67] Nor is the patristic view of the Jew based on literary stereotypes compensating for actual experience. The Jew is a personal acquaintance, unlike Shylock or the Jew of Malta, who were stereotypes based on distant memory. Origen, like Justin Martyr, was personally acquainted with Jews. Origen understood that Jewish calumny helped to cause Christian persecution, and that Jewish hatred was a fact of life for the Christians, continuing unabated after the repeated defeats of messianic politics. As we have seen, the revolutionary Jew was born, according to Origen, when the Jews chose Barabbas in place of Christ because "it is he who holds sway over them in their unbelief."[68] Like Justin, Origen feels that rabbis are the primary source of this hatred and the force that holds the Jewish people in their thrall. The rabbis are also responsible for the calumnies and blasphemies in the Talmud. Demonstrating familiarity with parts of the

Talmud, Origen mentions the Talmudic claim that Christ was born of an adulterous union of a Jewish whore and a Roman soldier named Panthera.

Jews, according to Origen, cling to a carnal, literal interpretation of the scriptures and persecute those who have the true spiritual understanding. Jewish proselytes are "especially bitter and their hatred lasts after the peace of the church, especially against converts from Judaism."[69] Persecutions, according to Origen, flowed inexorably from the Jews' rejection of Christ. The Jews not only crucified Christ, "the hatred of the Jews for Christ extended beyond the grave, for they bribed the soldiers to deny the resurrection of Christ."[70]

Origen was not only familiar with Josephus' account of the siege of Jerusalem in 70 AD; he draws theological conclusions from it. The Church fathers saw in the destruction of the Temple a repudiation of the Jews for their rejection of Christ and the destruction of their religion too. The Jews were in darkness because they laid violent hands on the light. Jerusalem was destroyed because of the sins of the Jews; that destruction is proof of the truth of what Christ had said. The Jews, according to Origen, were abandoned because of their rejection of Christ. "Jerusalem," he says, "may now be called wretched. It has no honor, no glory. It is without Temple, without altar, without sacrifice, without prophet, without priesthood, without any divine visitation whatever. The Jews are dispersed throughout the world and live as fugitives and exiles. They have been repudiated by God."[71]

Justin Martyr says the same thing. The foundation of Jewish worship was sacrifice that expiated sin and won the favor of God. With the destruction of the Temple, sacrifice became impossible. So the Jews were rendered unproductive and unfruitful, "though great and innumerable." They "drink up the doctrine of bitterness and impiety and reject the word of God."[72] Similarly, "the Jews think that because they are by the flesh the sons of Abraham and of Jacob they will be saved. In this they are completely deceived."[73] The promises to Abraham can no longer be fulfilled in the Jews. As we have seen before, if the priesthood, sacrifice, and Temple must continue, then Christians are the true Israelites, because only they, through Christ, have priesthood, sacrifice (in the Mass) and Temple (in Christ himself).

The destruction of the Temple caused a radical discontinuity in history. Origen deals with this discontinuity by refining the definition of the word Jew, a redefinition necessary because of confusion the word "hoi Iudaioi" caused in the Gospel of John. Origen distinguishes between the Jew *in occulto* and the Jew *in manifesto*. The Jew *in occulto* is the spiritual Jew, the follower of Christ. The Jew *in manifesto* is the carnal Jew, the biological descendant of Israel, the Jew who claimed to be the "seed of Abraham," whom Christ repudiated. Israel, according to Origen, means one who sees God. Everyone who has obtained the vision of God through faith and a sinless soul may be

called Israel. The synagogue, according to Origen, will continue to exist, but it will bear no fruit.

A number of consequences flow from this rejection. The Jews, who have abandoned the light of reason, the Logos, have no control over their passions. They will live in the darkness of unreason and, as a result, pursue their desires without restraint. They "are well represented by the figure of Barabbas," an ill-fated political insurrectionary.[74] They are also identified with Judas, "and with him go to hell."[75] The devil does not bother the Jews because "they have already fallen into his hands."[76] He now attacks the Church. The Jews are agents of the devil who accuse Christians of credulity while persecuting them and blaspheming Christ. Jews are unjustly proud of their carnal descent from Abraham and refuse to repent. The Jews practice magic, and are "foolish, hard-hearted, wise only in doing evil, unable to know the hidden plan of God," and are "useless to society."[77]

Origen, according to Wilde, "presents more clearly than any uninspired writer of the first three centuries, what was to prove to be the full traditional attitude of ecclesiastical authors toward the Jews."[78] In spite of their words, which seem harsh to modern ears, Wilde rejects the idea that the Church fathers are anti-Semitic because "there is no trace of any racial animosity on the part of Christians."[79] The fathers did not manifest "hatred of the Jews. . . . They were opposed to Judaism as a religion whose place is taken by Christianity and as an institution responsible for the death of Christ."[80] They also opposed the Jews because Jews were responsible for persecution of Christians. The "present wretched condition of the Jews . . . is due to their rejection of Christ and is a punishment for their sin."[81] That same wretched condition, persecution of the Jews, also flowed from "the temporal character of their messianic expectations."[82] Jewish revolutionary activity invariably created a violent reaction against all Jews. The Judaism practiced after Christ was "condemned as a religion which has been replaced, whose rites are therefore vain and useless."[83] The Judaism practiced before Christ, however, was "the precursor of Christianity, and, therefore, worthy of respect and reverence."[84] Like the Gospel of St. John, the writings of the Church fathers were anti-Jewish because they saw the Jew as a rejecter of Christ rather than someone with any real religious identity. Christian writers would often refer to Judaism as "*superstitio*," which is to say, confected by man not God, for carnal purposes. Wilde concludes "the Christian treatment of the Jews never descends to the *ad hominem* level."[85]

St. Irenaeus reiterates what Justin and Polycarp said before him and anticipates what Origen and others would say later. The Jews are rejected as Israel; their vineyard is turned over to the Gentiles; the Church is the New Israel. Irenaeus applies the parable of the wicked husbandmen to the Jews as did Jesus when he told the Jews "the kingdom of God will be taken from you and given to a people who will produce its fruit." Irenaeus makes the implication

clear. The rejection of Israel as an ethnic group meant the selection of the Gentiles as the Church. After comparing the Jews to the wicked husbandmen cast out of the vineyard, Irenaeus claims that the vineyard has been expanded to include the whole world and given to other husbandmen who will render its fruits. The vineyard "is no longer hemmed in, that is, no longer limited by Jewish narrowness."[86]

Irenaeus knows his idea engenders animosity among the Jews of his time because it engendered animosity among the Jews of Jesus' time. "When they heard his parables," Matthew recounts, "the chief priest and the scribes realized he was speaking about them, but though they would have liked to arrest him they were afraid of the crowds, who looked on him as a prophet" (Matthew 21:45-46).

Irenaeus thought the choice of Barabbas over Christ had lasting political implications. "In dishonoring the Son of God they chose Barabbas, a robber and a murderer. They denied the Eternal King, and preferred to admit the temporal Emperor as their king. For this reason God delivered their inheritance to the Gentiles and does not want them to return to the Law."[87] According to Irenaeus, all Jews are responsible for the rejection of Christ, "the people by not knowing Him, and the priests for attacking Him."[88] In claiming "we have no king but Caesar," Jews committed themselves to a political program that actively manifested their rejection of Christ. Jews would henceforth implement the promise of a messiah in a carnal fashion, which is to say, in a way opposite to the kingdom of God on earth.

St. Hippolytus of Rome takes this thought to its logical conclusion in his treatise on the Antichrist. The death of Christ at the hands of the Jews was anticipated in what they did to the Prophet Jeremiah. The desolation of Judaea and the burning of the sanctuary occurred after both events. Hippolytus says the Jews killed Christ because "they were disappointed in Him, for they thought that he was to establish a community on earth alone."[89] The same carnal messianic political desire for heaven on earth that led the Jews to choose Barabbas will lead the Jews who perdure in the rejection deeper into the service of the devil until they finally, it is argued, will bring about the reign of the Antichrist.

The Kingdom of the Antichrist, Hippolytus says, is a Jewish operation. Just as the Antichrist will bear "many apparent similarities to the true Christ," so too "the Jewish people over whom Antichrist will rule bear many apparent similarities to the people of God."[90] The Antichrist will first gather the scattered Jewish people into Jerusalem, where they will reconstruct the temple. The Antichrist, according to Hippolytus, "will resurrect the kingdom of the Jews."[91] The Antichrist thus will be the culmination of messianic politics. He will re-establish the superseded ethnic Israel as heaven on earth, but that heaven will be a hell for Christians. The Antichrist "will kill kings in battle" and be "a harsh ruler. He will bring tribulation and persecution against his enemies,"[92]

namely, the Church, the New Israel. In the meantime, each Jewish messiah will be an avatar of the Antichrist, because the Jews, "who gave themselves over to wickedness according as their temporal prosperity grew greater" and were "a stubborn people, and full of cunning, who feared not God, and had not shame before men" were condemned to mistake "the Antichrist for the true Messias" repeatedly.[93] "The Jews had an excessive desire for the things of this world, and too great a reliance upon their own strength." As a result, "the wrath of God fell upon them because of their part in the death of Christ, and it brought with it the following punishments: eternal blindness, loss of the Way which is Christ, eternal servitude to the Gentiles and destruction of the Temple."[94] The Jews would be punished in the aftermath of each intermediary Antichrist. In fact, "in the age to come the Jews will be horror-stricken at the punishment they are to receive."[95]

Bar Kokhba's failed rebellion did not end Jewish animus against Christianity; it merely required a change in strategy. Largely eschewing armed insurrection, the Jews turned to psychological warfare and promoted heresy instead. Irenaeus' work, as its title implies, was written to combat heresy, specifically Gnosticism, but in entering that fray he had to deal with the Jews, acknowledging "from the very beginning of the Gnostic attack on Christianity," that Gnosticism was associated with judaizing.[96] Irenaeus claims Simon Magus, the proto-heretic mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, "bears a Jewish imprint."[97] His ideas of God, of the world, of angels, of the Law and of man, according to Irenaeus, "all show Jewish influence."[98] Origen saw "Jewish influence on heresies such as Docetism and Gnosticism."[99]

Origen wrote "Heretics and Jews are grouped together as the conventicle of the wicked who build in vain"[100] over a century before Julian became emperor, but he could not have more accurately described Julian's project to rebuild the Temple—or its outcome. "Under Julian (361-63)," we are told, "there was a revival of Jewish national ambition connected with the attempt to rebuild the temple. The Jews of Antioch were certainly involved in this revival. In fact, the Jews fitted well into Julian's plan to restore paganism."[101] Graetz says "Julian's reign . . . was a period of extreme happiness for the Jews of the Roman Empire,"[102] and "Julian was greatly impressed by the God of Judaism,"[103] but the latter seems unlikely given his initiation into the Eleusinian mysteries and his desire to restore the pagan gods. Julian's attraction to the Jews was more political than theological, which historians closer to his time recognized.

Rufinus does not share Graetz's belief that Julian was "greatly impressed by the God of Judaism." Rufinus says in *Historia ecclesiastica*, written in about 400:

> So great was Julian's subtlety and shrewdness as to land even the unfortunate Jews in illusory expectations to which he himself was subject. He summoned them and confronted them with the question of

> why they do not perform sacrifices, although their laws obligate them to do so. But they sensing the opportunity of the moment said: 'We can do so only in the Temple of Jerusalem. For such is the command of the law.' Having obtained from him the permission to start with the work of reconstruction, they became so emboldened in their insolence as to make it appear that a prophet of theirs had come to them. From all regions and provinces there came Jews, to start with the reconstruction of the Temple which had long ago been consumed with fire. With the permission of the Emperor's representative they used public and private means to proceed in great haste. Meanwhile they started insulting our fellow Christians, as if the Jews' old kingdom were about to be reinstated. As the Jews grew in confidence and pride, they menaced Christians ever more heatedly."[94]

Socrates is more pointed in exposing Julian's political manipulation of the Jews and their messianic hopes. Julian, says Socrates,

> thought to grieve the Christians by favoring the Jews, who are their most inveterate enemies. But perhaps he also calculated upon persuading the Jews to embrace paganism and sacrifices; for they were only acquainted with the mere letter of Scripture, and could not, like the Christians and a few of the wisest among the Hebrews, discern the hidden meaning. . . . The emperor, the other pagans, and all the Jews, regarded every other undertaking as secondary in importance to this. Although the pagans were not well-disposed towards the Jews, yet they assisted them in their enterprise, because they reckoned upon its ultimate success, and hoped by this means to falsify the prophecies of Christ.[95]

An educated man, Julian understood the thrust of Christian anti-Jewish polemic. The Christians claimed that destruction of the temple proved the superiority of Christianity and that Christianity had superseded Judaism as the New Israel. Julian's desire to rebuild the Temple fit squarely into the trajectory of anti-Jewish Christian polemic. To blunt Christian claims, he could find no more willing allies than the Jews, who hated Christians and were eager to collaborate with those who held political power. The Jews had cried that they had "no king but Caesar," and now Caesar was reaching out to them, willing to support their deepest aspirations, the restoration of Jerusalem and its Temple.

In a letter "To the Community of the Jews," Julian promised "I will use all my zeal to make the temple of the Most High God rise again."[96] His reference to "the Most High God" flattered his Jewish audience, and Graetz was still taken in by the flattery a millennium and a half later. In his letter Julian affirmed that the Temple in Jerusalem alone was recognized by the Torah, and that it would have to be rebuilt before the Jews again had "sacred precincts" and "altars for sacrifice,"[97] thereby confirming everything the Christian fathers had said about the Church as the New Israel. He also

upped the ante. If he could build the Temple, he could reverse the course of history, prove that Christianity was a hoax, and prove that he himself was a god worthy of induction into the pantheon he was reconstructing. From a theological viewpoint, the decision to rebuild the Temple was the most ambitious construction project in history. "The high priest of the Hellenes would embarrass the god of the Galileans on his own terrain, making Him out to be a charlatan."[108]

St. John Chrysostom attributes more wickedness to Julian and more slyness to the Jews. Julian, according to Chrysostom (born 14 years before Julian's reign began and ordained a priest 23 years after Julian's death), "surpassed all the emperors in irreligion."[109] Julian did not begin by enlisting the Jews in his project to repaganize the Roman Empire; rather he "invited the Jews to sacrifice to idols in an attempt to drag them to his own level of ungodliness."[110] The Jews were cleverer than the emperor. They turned his project to their advantage, saying: "If you wish to see us offer sacrifices, give us back Jerusalem, rebuild the temple, show us the holy of holies, restore the altar, and we will offer sacrifices again just as we did before."[111] But the sacrifices the Jews promised were not going to be to Roman gods.

Chrysostom, too, felt "all Jews are responsible for Christ's passion and death, that they have been repudiated and cursed by God, and that they stand condemned out of the mouths of their own prophets."[112] Like Julian, Chrysostom had "received an excellent education in the Greek paidaeia."[113] Like Julian, Chrysostom saw the Jew as the primary enemy of the Christian. Anyone who saw the Church as a danger to the security of state and society, as Julian did, would "favor Judaism"[114] to remove Christianity as paganism's chief rival.

The stage was set for a battle of wills in which the emperor would attempt to force God's hand. Like latter-day evangelicals who show up at the Temple Mount in Jerusalem with dynamite to usher in Armageddon by blowing up the mosque built on the Temple's foundations, Julian would reverse the course of history by resurrecting the Jewish priesthood, sacrifice, and Temple.

Julian's claim was daring, but not preposterous, for as St. John Chrysostom makes clear in *Adversus Judaeos*, Christians accepted the premises of Julian's argument. If Julian could rebuild the Temple, then the Jews would be vindicated, and Christianity, the superseder, would itself be superseded. It may be difficult to imagine the construction of one building causing this, but the Temple in Jerusalem wasn't just any building. It was the *sine qua non* of the Jewish religion. If it could be rebuilt, the Jewish religion would be re-established, and if that were to happen, Christianity's claim to be the New Israel would be over. Christianity would be one sect among many, easily accommodated into Rome's pantheon.

Eusebius in *Demonstratio evangelica* claimed the Temple precincts had been completely obliterated by time and the Roman legions. The site of the Temple

was "ploughed and cultivated by Roman citizens in a way not at all differ... from other such fields."[115] Much earth and rubble had to be removed before t... foundations were laid bare and Julian's construction could begin. The Je... "blind to all things,"[116] called on the Emperor for help, and the Emperor happ... obliged. Julian turned to Alypius, distinguished prefect of Britain. Work w... smoothly, at the beginning. Roman know-how combined with Jewish wea... and enthusiasm seemed unbeatable. According to Ammianus, Julian "allot... enormous (*immodicis*) sums for the enterprise," sums which "were augmen... by contributions of the patriarch of all Judaism and other voluntary offerings, including costly garments and jewels handed over for the purpose by Jewi... women."[117] Jewish women, according to Eusebius, even "used their garmen... to help carry away the earth removed by diggers busy with making room fr... the new foundations."[118] The lone dissenting voice was St. Cyril, bishop o... Jerusalem, who according to Eusebius, predicted dire consequences for th... day lime was mixed to make mortar for the foundation stones.

The Jews scorned Cyril's prediction. The enthusiastic effort went smoothly for a while. Rubble that covered the site for centuries was removed, exposing the original foundation. But when new construction was about to begin things started to go wrong. "During the night," says Eusebius, "there arose a huge storm, the earth shook, and huge balls of fire burst forth from the ground and continued to do so through the next day. Instruments melted, workers were burnt to death, strange crosses appeared on clothes and bodies, a luminous cross shone in the sky, and the enterprise had to be abandoned. A violent tremor caused a portico to collapse killing a number of workers."[119]

According to St. John Chrysostom, Julian "overlooked nothing but worked quietly and a little at a time to bring the Jews to offer sacrifice, in this way he expected that it would be easy for them to go from sacrifice to the worship of idols."[120] The emperor's construction crew was about to start construction of the new temple, "when suddenly fire leaped forth from the foundations and completely consumed not only a great number of the workmen but even the stones piled up there to support the structure."[121]

Gregory of Nazianzen says the Jewish women "carried the dirt in their lap with no consideration for their robes and for the tenderness of their bodies, because they saw in all this a work of piety, as they carried everything downward" from the Temple foundations to a nearby valley.[122] "But," Gregory continues:

> a sudden whirlwind and the convulsion of the earth caused them to rush to a nearby church . . . as they [the Jewish women] reached the door of the church which was open, suddenly those doors closed, as if by an invisible hand, which filled with fear the impious and protest the devout. It is reported unanimously and held for certain that when they tried to open the door of the church, flames that burst forth from the inside prevented them from forcing the door open. The flames then burnt some of them

> and destroyed others. . . Still others lost various limbs of their bodies to the flames that burst from inside the church and burnt some of them to death."[123]

Gregory adds that those who refuse to admit the event's miraculous character "do not believe in any miracle of God."[124] Gregory, says Stanley Jaki, "was fully aware of the need of being credible when reporting about truly miraculous events."[125] He, therefore, scrupulously avoids embellishment in describing the second miraculous occurrence, "the appearance of a cross within a luminous circle in the sky" followed by the appearance of crosses on the clothing of the Jews:

> Anyone who was there found either on his vestments or on his body a luminous sign in the form of a cross, which exceeded the beauty of anything produced by a weaver or by a painter. On seeing this, they [the Jews] were so terrified as to invoke in one voice the God of the Christians and tried to expiate Him with many praises and supplications. Some even went so far as to seek out our priests and were after many prayers admitted into the Church, and introduced into the greater mysteries. They had their souls purified in baptism and so profited from their terror."[126]

Again, Jaki explains why Gregory could not exaggerate, much less lie: "Had he done so he would have exposed himself to immediate rebuttal by pagan admirers of Julian who were very numerous indeed and were not absent even from Cappadocia, a stronghold of Christianity. But neither Gregory, nor other erstwhile reporters of the event were challenged about the veracity of their presentation. Gregory. . . was never charged of falsifying or inventing facts."[127]

St. Ambrose, a former civil servant, also could not embellish the tale because it was within the memory of those still living, and any fabrication would have undermined his credibility with the people he wanted to impress. Yet he pulls no punches in describing the incident and its meaning to the Emperor Gratian. "Have you not heard how," Ambrose asked the Emperor in reference to a synagogue he planned to build, "when Julian had ordered the Temple of Jerusalem rebuilt, those who were carrying the rubbish were burned by fire from heaven? Are you not afraid that this will happen also now? In fact, you should not have given an order such as Julian would have given."[128]

Ammianus Marcellus, Julian's pagan biographer, reports "frightful balls of flame kept bursting forth near the foundations of the temple" which "made it impossible to approach the place," even though "Alypius pushed the work forward energetically" and "was assisted by the governor of the province."[129] Alypius ordered men to their deaths by ordering them into the flames from the Temple's foundations, but he eventually conceded defeat because "the elements [i.e., fire] persistently drove them back."[130] Ammianus notes, "Julian gave up the attempt."[131]

Socrates says the Jews were driven to doom by their desire to gratify their illicit passions:

> when God caused the earthquake to cease, the workmen who survived again returned to their task, partly because such was the edict of the emperor and partly because they were themselves interested in the undertaking. Men often, in endeavouring to gratify their own passions, seek what is injurious to them, reject what would be truly advantageous, and are deluded by their ideas that nothing is really useful except what is agreeable to them. When once led astray by this error, they are no longer able to act in a manner conducive to their own interest, or to take warning by the calamities which are visited upon them.
>
> The Jews, I believe, were just in this state; for, instead of regarding this unexpected earthquake as a manifest indication that God was opposed to the re-erection of their temple, they proceeded to recommence the work. But all parties relate, that they had scarcely returned to the undertaking, when fire burst suddenly from the foundations of the temple, and consumed several of the workmen.[132]

Socrates concludes: the incident is "believed by all; the only discrepancy in the narrative is that some maintain that flame burst from the interior of the temple, as the workmen were striving to force an entrance, while others say that the fire proceeded directly from the earth."[133]

The explosions dumbfounded Julian and his Jewish allies. The Jews "were astonished and struck with shame."[134] Julian, formerly "madly eager" to finish the project, was suddenly filled with fear, afraid fire might fall on his own head too. So "he and the whole Jewish people withdrew in defeat." Chrysostom comments: "Even today if you go into Jerusalem, you will see the bare foundation. If you ask why this is so, you will hear no explanation other than the one I gave. We are all witnesses to this, for it happened not long ago but in our own time."[135]

Julian tried to make the best of a bad situation in his letter "To a Priest." According to him, the Jewish prophets who scorned the worship of idols were brought low. Julian fails to note the idea to rebuild the Temple was his. Julian the idol worshipper concludes idols of all kinds are perishable. "The God of the Jews may be great," Julian says, "but He has not found worthy prophets and interpreters. The reason is that their souls have not been refined by a liberal education, and their eyes have not been purified by the light of study."[136] Julian thus tried to pin the failure on the Jews.

Some have claimed the explosions resulted from the "seepage of petroleum."[137] But there is no natural explanation. The Dead Sea, which contains asphalt, which does not explode, was 25 miles away and a thousand meters lower than the Temple. A recent *Jewish Encyclopedia* entry blithely claims no fire rose from the earth to stop work on the Temple, but Graetz is

not as reckless with the truth. Graetz admits "on the occasion of the pulling down of the ruins and the excavation of the foundations, a fire broke out by which several workmen lost their lives."[138] He ascribes "this subterranean conflagration" to "gases which had long been compressed there, and which, on being suddenly released from pressure, ignited on coming into contact with the air above."[139] "[T]hese sudden explosions," Graetz says, "disheartened the workmen, so that they gradually gave up work."[140] Graetz's explanation fails twice. First, Ammianus insists "frightful balls of flame kept bursting forth near the foundations of the temple,"[141] which could not occur from pent-up gas. If construction were halted by that kind of explosion, the explosion would have solved the problem. Construction could have resumed immediately. Ammianus states the fire "kept bursting forth,"[142] something incompatible with pent-up gas. Secondly, Graetz overlooks the implication that flows from use of Ammianus as his source. Ammianus is a pagan with a vested interest in a nontheological explanation unfavorable to the Christians. If there were evidence for a natural cause, Ammianus would have seized it.

Julian, Graetz recounts, "accused the Christians of having caused the fires to break out in the underground passages."[143] Graetz then attempts to rebut Chrysostom's account without mentioning him by name, claiming "the Christian authorities of the following generation relate the most wonderful tales of the miracles which are said to have happened during this impious rebuilding, the purpose of all of which was to warn the obdurate Jews and to glorify Christ."[144]

Graetz is playing the familiar role of the Jewish debunker, but his assessment of Chrysostom is not far off the mark. Chrysostom does assert that the attempt to rebuild the Temple was an act of impiety, and that the project's failure was a warning to obdurate Jews and a vindication of Christians. Julian did not make a second attempt. Julian and the Jews recognized the explosions as a sign the work should not continue. Julian was fatally wounded by a spear thrust in his side in his military campaign against the Persians, uttering, according to one account, "*Nenikekas Galilaiae*," just before his death or, as Swinburne rendered the phrase, "Thou hast triumphed, O pale Galilean." Another account has him saying, "Helios, thou hast ruined me!"[145] Christian legend attributes his death to St. Mercurius, a Roman soldier martyred a century before.[146] St. Mercurius' role in slaying Julian was memorialized in Orthodox iconography, but it appears first in the chronicle of John Malalas after 563. According to one account, Christ ordered Mercurius to slay Julian. Another says the Theotokos gave the order.

Either way, the champion of the Jews died by the rivers of Babylon, and Jewish hopes for a rebuilt Temple died with him. The Jews and the pagans were demoralized by their failure to reconstruct the Temple. Graetz says "the death of Julian in the neighborhood of the Tigris (June 363) deprived the Jews of the last ray of hope for a peaceful and unmolested existence."[147] The death

of Julian for all practical purposes ended Jewish political aspiration, certainly in Europe, for roughly a millennium. Towards the end of the 14th century, their hopes would revive briefly as they conspired with the Moors in Spain against the *Reconquista*, but they backed the wrong side and were expelled from Spain.

Chrysostom's explanation of Julian's efforts is straightforward; it is considerably less labored than Graetz's. The Emperor and his Jewish allies failed because they "failed to see that they were attempting the impossible" because if God destroyed their city, "no human power could ever change what God had decreed. . . . What God has reared up and wishes to remain, no man can tear down. In the same way, what he has destroyed and wishes to stay destroyed, no man can rebuild."[148]

The Jews' failed attempt to rebuild the Temple with help from the most powerful man on earth shows "how conspicuous our victory is" and how it could not be attributed to the efforts of Christians to halt it, because, Chrysostom says,

> This did not happen in the times of the good emperors; no one can say that the Christians came and prevented the work from being finished. It happened at a time when our religion was subject to persecution, when all our lives were in danger, when every man was afraid to speak, when paganism flourished. Some of the faithful hid in their homes, others fled the marketplaces and moved to the deserts. This is when these events occurred.[149]

The failure to rebuild the Temple happened when Christians were powerless, Chrysostom concludes, "So the Jews have no excuse left to them for their impudence."[150] Chrysostom is under no illusion that Jewish impudence will disappear, because it became part of their identity when they rejected Christ and would remain as long as they perdured in that rejection. The project of restoring the Temple was, according to Chrysostom, traceable to the Jewish character, which by resisting the Holy Spirit, has become revolutionary. What kind of men, Chrysostom asks, would rebuild the Temple? The answer is simple: the revolutionary Jew, or as he puts it:

> They were men who constantly resisted the Holy Spirit, revolutionists bent on stirring up sedition. After the destruction under Vespasian and Titus, these Jews rebelled during the reign of Hadrian and tried to go back to the old commonwealth and way of life. What they failed to realize was that they were fighting against the decree of God, who had ordered that Jerusalem remain forever in ruins.[151]

On February 27, 380, the Emperor Theodosius decreed Trinitarian Catholicism as the official religion of the Roman Empire. In 17 years, the Jews had suffered a complete reversal of fortune. The people who cried "We have no King but Caesar" found that Caesar had suddenly become a Christian. Theodosius's

decree brought many converts into the Church but it created another more complex problem for the Church, the danger of judaizing.

St. John Chrysostom was ordained to the priesthood six years after Theodosius issued his decree. The decree did not obliterate the status quo ante. Theodosius protected the Jews. The benefactions Julian had established were still in effect, and they gave the Jews a force and vitality dangerous to the local church. There were theoretical issues, too. Jewish monotheism seemed more rational than the Trinitarian formula that Christ was true God and true man; as a result, the Jews forged politically useful links with Arian heretics.

Chrysostom felt converts to the official religion of the empire often were "politically motivated to accept the Christian faith rather than committed to its way of life."[152] To meet this threat, Chrysostom gave a series of sermons known as *Adversos Judaeos*, translated as *Against the Judaizing Christians*, since that is his focus. The Jews and their synagogues were "a risk to the faith of this Christian community" that he countered "with every weapon in his rhetorical arsenal."[153] Chrysostom, along with Augustine and Jerome, has been accused of aiding and abetting "neurotic anti-Semites in every historical crisis affecting the Jews for more than the next 1500 years."[154] Chrysostom in particular, but the Church Fathers in general, portray the Jews as "sensual, slippery, voluptuous, avaricious and possessed by demons."[155] Additionally, Jews are "drunkards, harlots and breakers of the Law," as well as "the people who murdered the prophets, Christ and God."[156] The Jews are "pitiable" because they chose darkness over the Light. They are "pitiable and miserable" because "when so many blessings from heaven came into their hands, they thrust them aside and were at great pains to reject them. The morning Sun of Justice arose for them, but they thrust aside its rays and still sit in darkness."[157] They are also pitiable "because they rejected the blessings which were sent to them, while others seized hold of these blessings and drew them to themselves."[158]

The Church, as a result, has superseded the Jews. Christ said "it is not fair to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs." The Jews were originally the children, and the Gentiles the dogs, but the coming of Christ and his rejection by the Jews changed that. Now, said Chrysostom, "they became the dogs, and we became the children."[159]

The animus is theological not biological. Everything depends on the Jews' rejection of Christ. Everything can be rescinded by a rejection of the rejection. That rejection is the source of messianic politics because, as Chrysostom points out, "the Jews rejected the rule of Christ when they said: 'We have no king but Caesar.'"[160] In rejecting Christ, Chrysostom tells the Jews "you made yourselves subject to the rule of men."[161] And when the Jews "broke the yoke," he continues, "they grew fit for slaughter."[162] Messianic politics leads to the slaughter of the Jews who continue to reject Christ. The cycle is clear: prosperity leads to revolution and revolution leads to disaster:

> When brute animals feed from a full manger, they grow plump and become more obstinate and hard to hold in check. . . . Just so the Jewish people were driven by their drunkenness and plumpness to the ultimate evil; they kicked about, they failed to accept the yoke of Christ, nor did they pull the plow of his teaching. . . . Although such beasts are unfit for work, they are fit for killing. And this is what happened to the Jews: while they were making themselves unfit for work, they grew fit for slaughter.[163]

When Jews use their cultural influence to drag Christians after them into disaster, Chrysostom speaks out. "Dancing with bare feet in the marketplace," they lure Christians to destruction by luring them from the freedom of the Gospel back to the synagogue of Satan, where they "are gathering choruses of effeminates and a great rubbish heap of harlots."[164] In fact, "they drag into the synagogue the whole theater, actors, and all. For there is no difference between the theater and the synagogue."[165] Christians in Antioch were afflicted with the "deadly opinion" that they should "respect the Jews and think that their present way of life is a venerable one." Chrysostom's task is "to uproot and tear out this deadly opinion" to protect the Christians "still sick with the Judaizing disease" from seduction by the "indecency and laughter" which "fellowship with those who slew Christ" fosters.[166]

Antioch, where Chrysostom became bishop, had historical and cultural peculiarities that fostered judaizing. Antioch had Jewish inhabitants since its founding. When Antiochus IV Epiphanes tried to Hellenize those Jews by forcing them to eat pork, the Maccabees refused, choosing martyrdom rather than compromise. The tomb of the Maccabees was in Antioch, a shrine for Christians and Jews. Christians worshipped there because they were the New Israel and the Old Testament was their history; Jews worshipped there as a sign that there was no New Israel and to show the old covenant was still in force.

The situation was bound to lead to confusion. *De facto* syncretism resulted among new converts so strongly that it was difficult to tell demi-Christians from demi-Jews. They were, in effect, one and the same, a group "sick with the Judaizing disease,"[167] Chrysostom said. Chrysostom felt "the Judaizing sickness raged especially among women and slaves, who should be kept at home and away from the synagogues."[168] Devotion to the seven Maccabees spawned pilgrimages. The Maccabees were properly revered as precursors to the Christian martyrs, but they were also revered because they preferred death to violation of Jewish ritual, which led many to feel the Jewish law was still valid and binding on Christians. The Church eventually took over the synagogue that housed the relics of the Maccabees, but uprooting the syncretism engendered by devotion to the relics proved more difficult.

Hence, Chrysostom's sermons, which were intended for "those who are sick with the Judaizing disease." Chrysostom had to assert the orthodox mean

in the face of two heretical extremes. One the one hand, some Christians felt that going to the synagogue was the same as going to church. On the other hand, the Marcionists asserted that Jews and Christians worshipped different Gods, so great were the differences between the Old and the New Testaments.

The same golden mean applied to behavior. Jews were a pernicious threat to civil and moral order, but Jews should not be harmed. Judaizers were a constant threat to the purity of Christian doctrine, but Christians should not persecute them. If there is a curse on the Jews, it is of their own making, inflicted when they rejected Christ, and removable through acceptance of Christ. The proper place for the Jews is in the Church as Christians. The Jews can be saved. The friendly relations that existed between Justin and Trypho in the former's *Dialogue with Trypho* were both a model for future Christians and thought to be based on actual life. Christians, in other words, were opposed to Judaism on theological, not racial, grounds. The source of the animosity—rejection of Christ and persecution of Christians—could be overcome (some would later say, could only be overcome) by conversion. Conversion, however, should not be forced, nor should Jews be harmed.

But the Jews were a threat to Christian society that had to be contained. Jews were promoting syncretism or the sense that there was no difference between the Old and the New Covenant, luring unsuspecting newly-baptized but poorly catechized Christians into their synagogues, where they promised cures by Jewish doctors, who often used amulets and spells. Jews were also promoting elaborate musical productions that overshadowed the Mass. Unlike the Fathers of the Second Vatican Council, St. John Chrysostom tried to impede dialogue between Christians and Jews, especially when it entailed Christians and Jews worshipping together in the synagogue. To halt this dialogue, Chrysostom asks newly baptized Christians to consider that they are sharing their fasts "with those who shouted: "Crucify him, Crucify him," and with those who said: "His blood be upon us and our children." For those who "worship the Crucified" to "keep common festival with those who crucified him" is more than strange, it is "a sign of folly and the worst madness."[169]

Since many newly baptized Jews saw going to the synagogue as the equivalent of going to Mass, Chrysostom began his attack there: the synagogue "is no more than a theater into which the Jews drag effiminates, harlots, and actors."[170] The comparison with the theater is more invidious than it sounds to modern ears because obscene performances were often staged there. "To go to the synagogue," Chrysostom continues, "is a greater crime than going to the theater. What goes on in the theater is, to be sure, sinful; what goes on in the synagogue is godlessness."[171]

Chrysostom also hates the synagogue because of how it differs from the theater. The synagogue has the prophets; it has the law; it has the word of God; and yet it uses them to corrupt: "This is my strongest reason for hating

the synagogue: it does have the Law and the prophets. And now I hate it more than if it had none of these. Why is this? Because in the Law and the Prophets they have a great allurement and many a snare to attract the more simple-minded sort of men."[173]

Chrysostom also hates Judaism because "although they possess the Law they put it to outrageous use."[175] Because "they have heaped outrage on him whom the prophets foretold,"[174] "the man who sets a Judaizing Christian straight, wins a victory over godlessness."[175] The deceptive similarities between the Church and the synagogue are dangerous and troubling:

> this is the reason above all others *why I hate the synagogue* and abhor it. They have the prophets but do not believe them; they read the sacred writings but reject their witness—and this is a mark of men guilty of the greatest outrage. Let that be your judgment about the synagogue too. For they brought the books of Moses and the prophets along with them into the synagogue, not to honor them but to outrage them with dishonor.[176]

By luring unsuspecting Christians into synagogues, the Jews implicate the "saintly prophets" as "partners of their impiety" in rejecting Christ. So, "the harm they bring to our weaker brothers is not slight," because "when they see that you, who worship the Christ whom they crucified, are reverently following their ritual, how can they fail to think that the rites they have performed are the best and that our ceremonies are worthless"?[177]

Chrysostom finds the Jews' promotion of music especially troubling. By going to the synagogue and participating in the festivals of the trumpets, weaker brethren will "be emboldened to admire what the Jews do."[178] Blinded by spectacle and music, they will not see that what really stands "in their synagogue" is "an invisible altar of deceit on which they sacrifice not sheep and calves but the souls of men."[179] God is not worshipped in the synagogue; after the Jewish rejection of Christ, the synagogue "remains a place of idolatry."[180] Because Christ is God, "No Jew adores God!"[181] Chrysostom bases his claim on the authority of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, "For he said: 'If you were to know my Father, you would also know me. But you neither know me nor do you know my Father.' Could I produce a witness more trustworthy than the Son of God?"[182]

Chrysostom cites Matthew 12:43-45 as proof "demons dwell in the synagogue" and "these demons are more dangerous than the ones of old." "When God forsakes a place," he says, "that place becomes the dwelling of demons." The synagogue "is not merely a lodging place for robbers and cheats but also for demons. This is true not only of the synagogues but also of the souls of the Jews. . . who "live for their bellies; they grasp for the things of this world; their condition is no better than that of pigs or goats because of their wanton ways and excessive gluttony."[183]

Demons gained a foothold in the synagogue when the Jews "sacrificed their own sons and daughters to demons. They refuse to recognize nature, they forgot the pangs of birth, they trod underfoot the rearing of their children, they overturned from their foundations the laws of kinship, they became more savage than any wild beast."[184]

That savagery began in sexual license and culminated in rejection and crucifixion of Christ, a gratuitous act made more heinous because the Jews had their law given to them by God. "No necessity," Chrysostom continues, "forced the Jews when they slew their own children with their own hands to pay honor to the avenging demons, the foes of our life. . . . Because of their licentiousness, did they not show a lust beyond that of irrational animals. Hear what the prophet says of their excesses. 'They are become as amorous stallions. Every one neighed after his neighbor's wife.'"[185]

Sacrificing their children to idols paved the way for the synagogue's rejection of Christ. "Why is it," Chrysostom wonders, "that God put up with you in the old days when you sacrificed your children to idols, but turns himself away from you now when you are not so bold as to commit such a crime? Is it not clear that you dared commit a deed much worse and much greater than any sacrifice of children or transgressions of the Law when you slew Christ?"[186] As a result, the synagogue is worse than the theater, and "everything that goes on among the Jews today is a ridiculous sport, a trading in shame, filled with outrages beyond number."[187]

The Jews dedicated themselves to their lusts and sacrificing their children to idols. As a further impiety, they dedicated themselves to strict adherence to the Law and rigorous fasts after rejecting Christ who abolished the Law. "Now that the Law has ceased to bind," Chrysostom writes, "they obstinately strive to observe it. What could be more pitiable than those who provoke God not only by transgressing the Law but also by keeping it?"[188] The Jews offend God, "not only by transgressing the Law but also by wishing to observe it at the wrong time."[189] According to Chrysostom, Jewish legalism is as impious as Jewish lawlessness. "That is what destroyed the Jews. While they always kept looking for the old customs and life, these were stripped from them and they turned to impiety."[190]

In addition to blaspheming, Jews are "drunkards," a people in whom reason is overcome by the darkness of uncontrolled passion. Chrysostom uses the term "drunkard" because "drunkenness is nothing other than a loss of right reason, a derangement, and depriving the soul of its health."[191] For, Chrysostom continues,

> the man in love with a woman who is not his wife, the man who spends his time with prostitutes, is a drunkard. The heavy drinker cannot walk straight, his speech is rude, his eyes cannot see things as they really are. In the same way, the drunkard who is filled with the strong wine of his

> undisciplined passion is also unsound of speech; everything he utters is disgraceful, corrupt, crude and ridiculous; he, too, cannot see things as they really are because he is blind to what he sees. Like a deranged man or one who is out of his wits, he imagines he sees everywhere the woman he yearns to ravish. No matter how many people speak to him at gatherings or banquets, at any time or place, he seems not to hear them; he strains after her and dreams of his sin; he is suspicious of everything and afraid of everything; he is no better off than some trap-shy animal.[192]

If "the man in the grip of passion or anger is drunk" because "his reason is submerged," then "this is all the more true of the impious man who blasphemes God."[193] Just as the drunkard "has no awareness of his unseemly behavior. . . . So, too, the Jews are drunk but do not know they are drunk."[194] Anyone who goes to the synagogue or observes Jewish fasts, has "fallen among robbers, the Jews," who are "more savage than any highwaymen" because "they do greater harm to those who have fallen among them."[195] They did not strip a victim's clothes nor inflict wounds on his body as did robbers on the road to Jericho. The Jews have mortally hurt their victim's soul; they have "inflicted on it ten thousand wounds and left it lying in the pit of ungodliness." So Christians "must not turn to God's enemies, the Jews, for cures" because "this will only rouse his anger against them still more."[196]

Those who attend the synagogue and observe Jewish fasts destroy "the peace which comes from the harmony sent by the Spirit."[197] The Judaizers "are now tearing this peace asunder by destroying us and exalting the Jews. These men consider the Jews as more trustworthy teachers than their own Fathers; they believe the account of Christ's passion and death, which is given by those who slew Him. What could be more unreasonable than this?"[198]

Chrysostom felt the Jews would be a perennial danger to the Christian community. The Church must formulate that danger so future generations could act justly to the Jews but without prejudice to the Christian communities. "Let us," Chrysostom concludes, "not exalt our enemies' side and destroy our own."[199]

Once the Church became the established religion, it had to find a *modus vivendi* with the Jews. The Church, as a result, proposed for the first time in history a dfferent reaction to Jewish revolutionary activity, one based on Christian charity and forbearance. The normal reaction to Jewish revolutionary activity was to slaughter the Jews. That is what Vespasian, Titus, and Hadrian did, as did the Greeks on Cyprus and in Alexandria. The Church could not respond that way, but it also could not ignore the danger Jews posed in terms of cultural subversion and, ultimately, armed insurrection. It formulated its position with those dangers in mind.

Shortly after Chrysostom's death, the Church articulated what would become the constant teaching of the Church on the Jews. A law promulgated in either 412 or 418 announced: "Let no one who has done no harm be

molested on the ground that he is a Jew, nor let any aspect of his religion result in his exposure to contumely; in no place are their synagogues to be set afire, or wantonly damaged." In other words, no one was to harm the Jew. The Church fathers had learned that the Jew left unmolested tended to abuse his position and act in ways subversive to the common good. So the same law "warn[ed] the Jews that, elated, it may be, by their security, they must not become insolent and admit anything which is opposed to the reverence due to Christian worship."[200]

The relationship between Christians and Jews is central to Christianity. "There is," in fact, "no moment from the beginning to the end, when Christian legislation on the Jews is silent on their providential role, especially as guardians of Scripture and as destined for final salvation. That Jews are the people first chosen by God and never abandoned, an Elect whose failure, for all its tragedy in Christian eyes, is less a fall than a 'stumbling' (Rom 9: 1-11, 32), remains Catholic teaching."[201] That same Christian doctrine absorbed Roman law, so "the Jews could expect that the rights and privileges conceded them in the decrees of past emperors would be vindicated in the imperial courts," but they should not expect to expand them.[202] Christian Roman law added theological depth to what had been Imperial law. That generally played itself out in the following fashion. Christian Roman law "declared it illegal to confiscate or to burn down existing synagogues, but, on the other hand, generally forbade the construction of new ones."[203] Jews were not permitted to ridicule the Christian faith; they were not to introduce "the sign of our worship into their buffooneries," and they must "restrain their rites, keeping them this side of contempt for the Christian Law."[204] In 1215 a decree of the Fourth Lateran Council forbade Jewish ridicule of Christian Good Friday services.

The Church dealt with Jewish subversion too. One law prohibited military careers for Jews. A decree of 439, "proclaimed as 'valid forever' a statute that declared Jews ineligible to hold any civil office that included power to judge or to pronounce sentence against Christians."[205] Similarly, if a Jew attempted to subvert the faith of a Christian with "perverse teaching" his goods and life were forfeit.[206]

The Church also forbade Jews from owning Christian slaves. This prohibition went back to the Roman empire; it was adopted by the papacy and incorporated into canon law. "In 339, Constantius II proclaimed that Jews could possess no slave 'of another sect or nation' and should he attempt to obtain one the slave was expropriated to the imperial treasury."[207] Reiterated often by popes, the prohibition became part of the teaching of the Church. "A pious Jew ought not to keep in his house a slave who refused persistently to be circumcised; after a year, he ought to be sold back to the idolaters whose convictions he refused to relinquish."[208] If a Jew knowingly bought a Christian slave, all his possessions were forfeited.

Pope Gregory the Great was especially adamant in opposition to Jews owning Christian slaves. In this, the Church added theological nuance to the practice of the Roman empire. As the epistles of St. Paul made clear, master and slave enjoyed equal stature before God. Unlike Aristotle, who felt certain men were slaves by nature, the Church considered slavery a sociological accident, even if recognized by law. The Jews were an exception because they were "willing slaves of Torah."[209] They chose the bondage of the law over the freedom of Christ and wanted to spread this bondage to anyone under their cultural influence. Pope Gregory was loath "to expose the faith of Christian slaves to the daily pressure of its Jewish denial, embodied in masters whose social superiority might seem to reinforce the plausibility of their claims to religious superiority."[210] No Christian soul was worth the risk posed by Jewish subversion. Gregory was unwilling to turn a blind eye to the risk, and so the only alternative was to forbid Jews from owning Christian slaves. When Gregory heard that Brunichilda, Queen of the Franks, permitted Jews to hold Christian slaves, he rebuked her in writing. Hearing of the circumcision of pagan slaves by Samaritan owners, Gregory declared the practice "'detestable to us, and altogether hostile to the laws'; such slaves, he directed, were to be set free immediately and far from receiving some reimbursement for them, the masters were to face the penalty of law."[211] A bishop who did not insist on enforcement of these laws was rebuked for allowing Jewish masters "less by persuasion than by virtue of their power" over Christian slaves, to bring them to subserve "Jewish superstition." Gregory felt that it was "altogether unwholesome and accursed that Christians be in servitude to Jews."[212] If a Christian slave fled his Jewish master and took refuge with the Church, he was not to be returned to his Jewish owner, nor was his owner reimbursed, whether the slave was a Christian of long standing or newly baptized. Jews who owned Christian slaves had to dispose of them to Christian masters within 40 days. If the Jew transferred the slave to another member of his family he could be prosecuted for fraud.

As in many areas of Church life—sacred music, for example—Gregory formulated the Church's position on the Jews. He is the founder of the celebrated medieval "Constitution on the Jews," which goes by the name "*Sicut Judaeis non*." Culled from more than 850 letters, Gregory's teaching was cited by every succeeding pope when the issue arose. According to Synan, Gregory "canonized" the existing civil law. Gregory strove to balance persecution and the unjust appropriation of property on the one hand with a laxity that would allow if not encourage subversion on the other. He came up with a formula: "As the determination of law does not permit the Jews to erect new synagogues, so also does it permit them to possess their old ones without disquietude."[213]

Gregory's position was an example of theological grace perfecting Roman legal nature. From a theological perspective, the Jew was deficient in faith,

"burdened with perfidia,"[214] a faith that is wrong because it is truncated, distorted, and ultimately a form of disbelief. Gregory does not refer to Judaism as a religion. Putting it on the same level as the Christian faith was unthinkable, no matter what the two shared. Judaism was a "*superstitio*," a cult outside of the official religion. "This superstition," the Pope warned, would "pollute" Christian faith and "deceive with sacrilegious seduction" simple Christian peasants.[215] Indeed, Gregory termed Judaism a disaster, *perditio*. Pope Gregory described Jews as "Stone of Darkness" and "shadow of death," "wild asses," "dragons for poisonous ideas," the "shaken reed" of Isaiah, a kingdom "gleaming without, but empty within." He describes "their hearts" as "the den of a beast."[216] Gregory got these terms from the book of Job. His appropriation of the vocabulary of the prophets was also prophetic. The split between faithful Hebrews and unfaithful Hebrews had been superseded by the split between the Jews who voluntarily chose bondage to the Law and the New Israel who embraced the freedom conferred by faith in Christ. "After the appearance of One he recognized as Messiah," Synan tells us, "Gregory could see in Judaism only a retrogression."[217]

Even though Judaism was retrogression, the Jew could not be coerced from his unbelief because the Christian faith could only be a free acceptance of a gift from God. Gregory encouraged Jewish conversion, but forbade forced baptism "with all possible firmness," according to Synan.[218] But his firmness implies that forced baptism happened nonetheless. A bishop, he wrote, ought to replace force with preaching. "Reason is so little profane that Logos, Word and thought, can serve as a divine name."[219] Reason was the only licit means to lead perfidious Jews to the Logos. Subsequent popes would interpret this by forcing Jews to listen to sermons but never forcing them to accept baptism. Gregory termed it, "A novelty, indeed a thing unheard of, is this doctrine that extorts faith through blows."[220]

The prohibition against coercion applied to overly zealous converts from Judaism as well as to bishops and heads of state. When a convert from Judaism invaded the synagogue in Cagliari, Sardinia, to plant a cross and an image of Mary on the day of his baptism, he earned the rebuke of the local bishop, a rebuke Gregory would have seconded. "The unwilling," as Gregory said, "are not to be compelled."[221] He established the principle that the assent of faith cannot be the object of intimidation. "We forbid," he wrote, "that the aforesaid Hebrews be burdened or afflicted contrary to the order of reason; rather, just as they are permitted to live in accord with Roman statutes, they can, as they know, order their activities without hindrance, and to this Justice gives assent."[222] Gregory rebuked a fellow bishop when he confiscated a synagogue and its guesthouse. "Our brother has acted unsuitably,"[223] he wrote, and what he did was not just. What has been given to sacred use cannot be withdrawn without sacrilege. The bishop responsible must pay for the buildings, thus making them the legitimate property of the Church, and guaranteeing that

the Jews "should in no way appear to be oppressed, or to suffer an injustice."[225] Forbidding Jewish worship will not lead to the conversion of the Jews, Gregory continued. They are to be converted by reason; until then, "Let them enjoy their lawful liberty."[225]

The Jews, however, continued to test the limits of papal tolerance with their cultural subversion. Acting on a complaint from the Jewish community of Rome, Gregory responded with a letter of incalculable importance because it contains the formula "*Sicut Judaeis non*," a formula "destined to recur endlessly in papal documents concerning Jewish rights and disabilities throughout the Middle Ages."[226] "Just as license," Gregory writes, "ought not to be presumed for the Jews to do anything in their synagogues beyond what is permitted by law, so in those points conceded to them, they ought to suffer nothing prejudicial."[227] Jews have the right to practice their religion without harm, but they should not be granted positions of cultural influence from which they could spread error and subversion.

That would remain the papal position throughout the Middle Ages, and because of it, the Papal States often were a refuge for Jews persecuted in other Christian countries. When Jews were subjected to forced baptism, expelled from Spain, or both, many took refuge in the Papal States, much to the chagrin of Spanish princes. Poland erred in the opposite way by allowing Jews too much cultural influence, something the Poles regretted when rapacious neighbors partitioned Poland at the end of the 18th century.

The Jews never perceived "*Sicut Judaeis non*" as a model of judicious tolerance and forbearance. Gregory's formulation occurred during unprecedented upheaval in the Roman empire, a time best described as the empire's death throes, when civil order broke down and the rule of the strong—*homo lupus homini*—seemed more likely to succeed Roman order than did the new religion. Gregory was concerned with injustices against Jews, but also about the breakdown of public order. "At this time especially," he wrote, "when there is fear of the enemy, you must not have a divided populace."[228]

The codification of the new Jewish religion occurred about the time the Church articulated its position on the Jews. The first articulation of "*Sicut Judaeis non*" appeared between 412 and 418. The Babylonian Talmud was codified during the fifth-century by the Amoraim, beginning with Rabbi Ashi, who died in 427, and culminating in the work of Rabbi Abina, who died in 499. It was as if Christians and Jews needed to brace themselves against the coming barbarian invasion by putting what they believed in writing, lest it be swept away in the coming chaos. Alaric sacked Rome in 410. Augustine's *City of God* was written in response. Someone had to explain how the hand of God could be discerned in the destruction of civilization.

Those Jews not busy writing down the Talmud were preparing for another messiah, the Cretan Moses, who announced he had come to usher in the end of the world, something predicted to occur between 440 and 470. As the

would a millennium later, the Jews abandoned their property and neglected their businesses, waiting for Moses to divide the waters of the Mediterranean and lead them dry-shod back to Palestine. On the appointed day, the latter-day Moses led his followers to a cliff overlooking the ocean and commanded them to jump. Many complied. Some drowned; sailors rescued others. The false Moses disappeared never to be seen again.[229]

After one disappointment after another, the Jews' messianic politics largely went into remission. No one, however, could predict a remission lasting over a millennium. No one other than St. Hippolytus of Rome in his writings on the Antichrist would have predicted the return of revolutionary messianic politics after so long an absence. But the codification of the Talmud, the hubbub surrounding the failure of Moses of Crete and the fall of Rome (after which Genseric the Vandal carried the sacred vessels of the Temple from Rome to Carthage), and the articulation of the Church's policy toward the Jews were each a manifestation of the Zeitgeist of collapse and uncertainty. Graetz called the time of the compilation of the Babylonian Talmud "one of the most important epochs in Jewish history."[230] Thereafter, "the Babylonian rather than the Jerusalem Talmud became the fundamental possession of the Jewish race, its life's breath, its very soul."[231] The Babylonian Talmud defined Jewish life during the millennium of remission, when revolutionary politics went dormant and Catholic culture created Europe. "For more than a thousand years," Graetz says,

> nature and mankind, powers and events, were for the Jewish nation insignificant, non-essential, a mere phantom; the only true reality was the Talmud. A new truth in their eyes only received the stamp of veracity and freedom from doubt when it appeared to be foreseen and sanctioned by the Talmud. Even the knowledge of the Bible, the more ancient history of their race, the words of fire and balm of their prophets, the soul outpourings of their Psalmists were only known to them through and in the light of the Talmud.[232]

The Talmud absorbed the Torah, allowing the Jews to view the rise of Christian Europe with consolation born from disdain. Graetz claims "the Babylonian Amoraim created that dialectic, close-reasoning Jewish spirit, which in the darkest days preserved the dispersed nation from stagnation and stupidity."[233] It also ensured the Jews of Europe, unlike the Jews of Antioch, were cut off from contact with Christianity. Judaizing, as described by St. John Chrysostom, became a thing of the past, replaced by two completely separate societies even though they lived in close proximity—with contact, at least in Poland, only when usury or illicit sex was involved. The Talmud, says Graetz, "preserved and promoted the religious and moral life of Judaism," but it did so by bringing about separation and control, insuring "there could not arise that dream-life, that disdain of the world, that hatred of reality, which

in the Middle Ages gave birth to and sanctified the hermit life of the monks and nuns."[234]

The Talmud may have protected the Jews from schism and sectarian divisions, but the price the Jews paid for this protection was complete rabbinic control. The Talmud took the sacred scriptures out of the hands of the Jews and made their interpretation the sole purview of the rabbis as codified in Talmudic lore. The word of God was nullified by the Talmud. The Talmud, the saying went, permitted whatever the Torah forbade. The Jew, in other words, could not appeal to sacred writ without the permission of the rabbis who controlled the Talmud. The Talmud became, as a result, control through hermeneutics. The Talmud became, according to Walsh, "the chief means employed by the Annas and Caiaphas of each age to keep the mass of the Jewish people in ignorance of the true nature of Christianity, and to fan their misunderstanding of it to hatred."[235] To fan this hatred, the Talmud contained "the most scurrilous and vindictive blasphemies against Christ."[236] The Talmud claimed that Christ was a bastard (Kallah 51A) offspring of a Jewish whore and a Roman soldier (Sanhedrin 106A) who is in hell buried in boiling excrement (Gittin 57A). During persecution, the most controversial parts of the Talmud were committed to memory and transmitted orally, but the tradition of blasphemy and subversion continued unabated. The Talmud insured blasphemy and subversion became part of Jewish culture, because, as one scholar noted, the Talmud was "the creator of the Jewish nation and the mold of the Jewish soul."

The Talmud would also be instrumental in the rise of the revolutionary spirit when it re-emerged during the Reformation. "We can boldly assert," Graetz writes, "that the war for and against the Talmud aroused German consciousness and created a public opinion without which the Reformation, like many other efforts, would have died in the hour of birth, or perhaps would never have been born at all."[237] The Talmud also became the link between the Neoplatonist thaumaturgy of Julian and later assaults on the Catholic Church from behind the mask of freemasonry. Masonic theology, according to Rabbi Benamozegh, is "at root nothing else than . . . the theology of the Kabbalah."[238]

Chapter Four

Rome Discovers the Talmud

On November 27, 1095, Pope Urban II broke precedent at the council he had convoked; he addressed not only the bishops at the cathedral but the entire population in a field outside of Clermont's eastern gate. His topic was the humiliations Christians were suffering at the hands of infidels in the Holy Land. He asked them to leave their possessions and families and march in one great Christian army marked with the sign of the Cross to Jerusalem to restore that city to its rightful owners, namely, Christians for whom Christ died there.

Urban indicated there would be other benefits too, "since this land France which you inhabit, shut in on all sides by the seas and surrounded by the mountain peaks is too narrow for your large population; nor does it abound in wealth and it furnishes scarcely enough food for its cultivators."[1] Urban spoke when Europe was on the cusp of change. Prosperity and stability had increased since the collapse of the Roman empire; that prosperity led to increased population, which the feudal agricultural economy could not absorb. In subsequent centuries, the market economy would replace the agricultural subsistence economy of the feudal era.

The main vehicle for that transition was wool. Peasants and small landowners producing wool cloth for themselves already had the capital equipment—the spinning wheels, looms, etc.—to produce a surplus, which could be sold for cash, the *sine qua non* of the market economy. Because wool varied from region to region, and what was common in one was desired in another, commerce aided development of the market economy. The Danube basin became famous for Loden cloth, which was more water repellent than cloth from other areas. The German principalities became famous for black wool cloth, which the clergy demanded, and the Low Countries became famous for wool that took dye particularly well. The surplus population of northwestern Europe, a particularly rich agricultural area, drifted into the cities, taking up trades like fuller and dyer, and soon became Europe's nascent proletariat, people who owned nothing but their time, which they hired out, and who produced nothing but *proles*, or children. This uprooted,

impoverished population became the mainstay of the crusading armies. With soldiers like this, trouble could be expected, and trouble followed within a year of the pope's proclamation.[1]

Within a month of Urban's call for a crusade, the Jews of France were "gripped by fear and trembling,"[2] sending letters to Jewish communities in the Rhineland warning them to fast and pray for deliverance. The French Jews were spared because of the discipline of the French crusaders, kept in line by feudal lords who responded to the pope's call. Along the Rhine, though, the rulers were weak and ineffective, and the cities were teeming with the uprooted, men who had already broken with tradition in leaving the land.

The Jews had been in France and the adjacent areas of the Rhine Valley ever since their disastrous revolutionary insurrection against Rome had been crushed and the Temple in Jerusalem destroyed. The Jews had come to the Rhine valley in the time of the Romans because they were merchants; the Rhine and the Danube rivers constituted the major commercial corridor for central Europe. In *Ashkenaz*, the Hebrew word for Germany, the *Ashkenazim* learned their new language, *Juedische Deutsch* or Yiddish.

The Jews brought their messianic politics to the Rhine Valley. Being a revolutionary was for many part of what it meant to be a Jew, even if no one had acted militarily for almost a millennium. The Jews, according to Norman Cohn, "refused to be absorbed into the populations amongst which they lived" even though "their lot in the early Middle Ages was by no means a hard one."[4] The Diaspora meant the dispersion of revolutionary politics; in the millennium following the defeat of Simon bar Kokbha, the Jews interpreted the destruction of the Temple and subsequent Diaspora as God's plan for spreading revolution. "What made the Jews remain Jews," according to Cohn, "was. . . their absolute conviction that the Diaspora was. . . a preparation for the coming of the Messiah and the return to a transfigured Holy Land."[5]

Around the time of the first crusade, millennialism, the Jewish messianic philosophy of history and political liberation based on the Book of Daniel, broke out in Europe after remaining largely dormant for a millennium. Ironically, it broke out among people who were not Jews, and, more ironically, the Jews suffered at their hands. The Jews, says Cohn, "rarely inspired armed risings, and never amongst European Jews."[6] But during the rise of cities in Europe, when European Christians first came in contact with Jews in significant numbers, "the desire of the poor to improve the material conditions of their lives became transfused with phantasies of a new Paradise on earth, a world purged of suffering and sin, a Kingdom of the Saints."[7] At the close of the 11th century, "it was no longer Jews but Christians who cherished and elaborated prophecies in the tradition of 'Daniel's dream' and who continued to be inspired by them."[8] The temptation to look for heaven on earth was known as judaizing, which took messianic inspiration from a distorted interpretation of the Old Testament, but usually without the further distortions of the Talmud.

It was a perennial temptation for Christians who failed to find solace in "a messiah who suffered and died [and] a kingdom which was purely spiritual."[9] The Book of Daniel, the Christian Scripture most likely to be corrupted by Judaizers, seemed to prophesy an earthly kingdom while also offering a key to understanding history in the parable of the colossus with the feet of clay:

> Generation after generation was seized at least intermittently by a tense expectation of some sudden, miraculous event in which the world would be utterly transformed, some prodigious final struggle between the hosts of Christ and the hosts of antichrist through which history would attain its fulfillment and justification.[10]

Heaven on earth was a Jewish idea; hence, Cohn finds it "natural enough that the earliest of these prophecies should have been produced by Jews"[11] convinced they were God's chosen people for whom things had not gone well since the destruction of the Temple. What sharply distinguished the Jews from other peoples was their attitude towards history and in particular towards their own role in history. "Precisely because they were so utterly certain of being the Chosen People," Cohn tells us, "Jews tended to react to peril, oppression and hardship by phantasies of the total triumph and boundless prosperity, which Yahweh, out of his omnipotence, would bestow upon his Elect in the fullness of time."[12] The disparity between an unbelievably happy future and a wretched present led the Jews to believe "out of an immense cosmic catastrophe, there will arise a Palestine which will be nothing less than a new Eden."[13] Throughout the Diaspora, the fantasy of a temporal heaven on earth coming about in and through history (as opposed to in eternity) captured the minds of the Jews and anyone in contact with the Jews who also considered themselves oppressed. The Diaspora created exaggeration: "for the first time the glorious future kingdom is imagined as embracing not simply Palestine but the whole world."[14] Through their suffering, the Jewish people would liberate all mankind. The Christian undertone is unmistakable. Moses Hess would take this reasoning to its logical conclusion in the 19th century, claiming the Jewish people had become its own messiah. In the meantime:

> The tyranny of that power will become more and more outrageous, the sufferings of its victims more and more intolerable—until suddenly the hour will strike when the Saints of God are able to rise up and overthrow it. Then the Saints themselves, the chosen, holy people who hitherto have groaned under the oppressor's heel, shall in their turn inherit dominion over the whole earth. This will be *the culmination of history.*[15]

The millennialist kingdom that will be "the culmination of history" and that "will have no successors" found numerous adherents from Karl Marx to the neoconservative Francis Fukuyama, whose *The End of History* announced the neoconservative millennium when Marx's millennium failed. The revolutionary chiliasm Marxists and anti-Marxist Neoconservatives would

champion emerged in the Rhine Valley during the first crusade, and it caused problems there for four centuries, culminating in the Anabaptist uprising in Muenster in 1533. Cohn claims there is "no evidence" of revolutionary chiliasm in Europe "before the closing years of the 11th century," i.e., before the first crusade.[16] Since revolutionary chiliasm was a Jewish idea, the necessary condition for its outbreak in the Rhine Valley seems to have been contact with Jews. Subsequent events bore this out.

Contact between Jews and Christians meant a cross-fertilization of ideas. For every Jew who became Christian, there seemed to be ten judaizing Christians eager to use Daniel as an all-encompassing theory of history that allowed them to seek heaven on earth. Judaizers repudiated Augustine's claim that the millennium arrived with the Church, the New Israel. The Judaizers wanted a more "carnal" kingdom. Millennialism broke out in the Rhine Valley among Christians who had contact with revolutionary ideas in the cities that had replaced the monasteries as commercial entities.

"Like so many generations of Jews before them," Cohn says, the Christians of the Rhine Valley "saw history as divided into two eras, one preceding and the other following the triumphant advent of the Messiah," who, according to Commidanus, "will be at the head not of an angelic host but of the descendants of the ten lost tribes of Israel, which have survived in hidden places, unknown to the rest of the world."[17] The idea of the Ten Lost Tribes would recur wherever judaizing dominated, culminating in England in the 17th century when Menasseh ben Israel wrote a best-seller among the Puritans on the topic.

When Jewish revolutionary activity went dormant for almost 1000 years, the Church by and large forgot about it, until attacks on Jews after the call for the First Crusade refocused her attention. Even more confusing was the reemergence of the "error of the Jews," i.e., the desire for an earthly kingdom, among people who were not Jews and seemed to hate the Jews. Messianic revolutionary politics re-emerged among the proletariat in Christian Europe, a phenomenon as shocking and violent as it was perplexing. Millennialism inevitably resulted when the urban proletariat of the Low Countries came into contact with Jewish messianic politics. "The Church's fear of the popularity of Jewish messianism," Lea Dasberg says, "was definitely no figment of her imagination."[18] It always posed a threat to Catholic theology; now it posed a threat to the social order. St. Jerome, she continues, had condemned Millennialism as "Jewish dogma, Jewish traditions, and Jewish fables."[19] And Christians who believed this sort of thing were denounced as "judaizing Christians" and "demi-Jews." The constellation of ideas revolving around the "end of days" concept was Jewish, as much as the idea that the rise of Jerusalem would follow the decline of Rome. Add to that the notion that the Jews were again predicting the advent of the Messiah in the very year preparations were being made for the First Crusade, and you get a sense of why Millennialism

swept the Rhine Valley and took root among the uprooted. It did so "amongst the masses in the overpopulated, highly urbanized areas," Cohn says, because

> there were always many who lived in a state of chronic and inescapable insecurity, harassed not only by their economic helplessness and vulnerability but by the lack of the traditional social relationships on which even at the worst times, peasants had normally been able to depend. These were the people whose anxieties drove them to seek messianic leaders and they were also the people who were most prone to create demonic scapegoats.[20]

The scapegoats were the Jews; the perpetrators of violence against them, ironically, were often judaizing priests and monks. According to Cohn's reading of John of Roquetallade's *Vademecum in tribulationibus*, "the old eschatological tradition" based on the "carnal" reading of the Book of Daniel, "had been adapted as a vehicle for the new social radicalism."[21] Rootless apostate monks assumed political leadership among the rootless proletarians of the cities; often the local and higher clergy bore the brunt of the attack after it glanced off the Jews. Just as often, the higher clergy alone could stop the violence. According to Cohn, the leadership of millennialist movements "passed into the hands of a number of *prophetae*, who seem to have consisted largely of dissident or apostate clerics." "Apostate monks in Germany" whipped the rootless masses into an apocalyptic frenzy as a way of "destroying clergy and Church." Revolutionary chiliasm was as anticlerical as it was anti-Semitic.[22]

In April, 1096, Peter the Hermit, a monk inspired by Urban II's call for a crusade against the infidel, arrived in Trier, the ancient Roman city on the Moselle River. He had letters of introduction from the French Jews, which he used to demand money and provisions from the Jews in the Rhineland. The Jews in Trier must have acceded to his demands because by the end of the month he was in Cologne making the same demands.

Peter the Hermit wasn't just interested in raising money. He was also interested in raising troops. To do that, he engaged in the motivational speaking then known as preaching. Count Emicho (or Emico or Emmerich) of Leiningen, a minor landowner from Upper Lorraine, was touched by his words. Emicho is what Liddell-Hart and Englishmen of his generation would have called a "bad hat,"[23] and typical of the bad hats who were attracted to irregular warfare. Ekkehard writes that Emicho was "count of those regions that lie about the Rhine, and long infamous in the extreme." He was a man "of very ill repute on account of his tyrannical mode of life."[24] He was also what Msgr. Knox would call an "enthusiast"; he claimed to receive private revelations from the Lord about his anointing as a charismatic leader. Emicho called himself the "Emperor of the Last Days"[25] and claimed that he would conquer Jerusalem for Christ. Ekkehard claims he was "called to religion

in this guise by divine revelations," and "like a second Saul, he usurped [illegible] himself the leadership of nearly 12,000 who had taken the Sign."[26] Emi[illegible] then led these men "through the cities on the Rhine, the Main and [illegible] Danube."[27] Emicho believed that, if it was meritorious to wage war on [illegible] infidel in Jerusalem, then it was doubly meritorious to wage war on the infid[illegible] at home. "Let us, therefore," he concluded, "take our revenge first on [illegible] Jews], and extirpate them from among the nations."[28]

One commentator described Emicho as an "accomplished charlatan," wh[illegible] "claimed that he had been divinely anointed for leadership in the messian[illegible] mode."[29] As the Franciscans of Medjugorje have shown in our day, thugge[illegible] and charisma are not mutually exclusive. Indeed, they are often united b[illegible] Messianic politics. Emicho, according to his self-proclaimed anointin[illegible] "would defeat the forces of Islam and establish himself triumphantly in th[illegible] Holy City. There he would do battle once again, this time destroying the eve[illegible] more powerful army of Antichrist, the satanic son of a Jewish harlot, wh[illegible] aspired to rule the world in the name of the devil."[30] This would usher in th[illegible] millennium—a thousand years of glory with Christ as king of the world—beginning with the military conquest of Islam, and culminating in conversio[illegible] of the Jews. Because there were no Muslims along the Rhine, but there wer[illegible] plenty of Jews, the order of conquest was reversed. The crusaders "made i[illegible] their concern, wherever the execrable Jewish people were found, either to wip[illegible] them out completely, or to force them within the bosom of the Church."[31]

On May 3, 1096, Emicho arrived at the gates of Speyer at the head of his crusading army. He gave the Jews there the choice of baptism or death. The situation was probably similar in all towns along the Rhine, Main, and Danube when the crusading armies appeared. A large mob milled around the town square with nothing to do as negotiations took place behind the scenes. Then, growing impatient with the delay or fired up by a preacher, or both, the mob would sack homes in the Jewish quarter, motivated by a desire to punish infidelity, a desire to avenge long-standing grudges, particularly over the lending of money, or a desire to re-quisition material for the military campaign against the Muslims.

Unable to defend themselves, the Jews would flee to the palace (or fortress) of the local bishop and implore his protection, offering money to facilitate his altruism. The Jews of Speyer "fled for refuge to the Bishop of the city, and he undertook, not without suffering the accusation of both Jews and Christians that Jewish money assisted him in the decision, first to defend the Jews and second to punish those guilty of the outrage." Punishment meant that those implicated in the attacks on the Jews had their hands cut off by order of the bishop, who "was moved with wrath at this and bought by the Jews' money."

On May 24, three weeks after pillaging Speyer, Emicho arrived in Worms, where similar carnage followed. The crusaders milled around the town square until a riot broke out, then the mob ran amok and killed 300 Jews

The crusaders "slaughtered young and old alike." In the Jewish quarter, they looted the Jews' homes, there trampling Torah scrolls underfoot.

Half the Jews remained in their houses in Worms. The other half fled to the bishop. A day or two after the initial attack, 500 Jews were holed up at the bishop's compound, hoping to weather the storm there. Many Jews committed suicide while waiting for the bishop to rescue them. According to one Jewish report, one "pious lady . . . slew herself for the hallowing of the divine Name"[32] rather than convert. The Jewish reports are largely hagiographic, but even so, they mention that many Jewish survivors "were rescued by the Bishop, without having to change their faith."[33]

The sheer numbers of the crusaders overwhelmed the bishop, who had some armed men at his command. As a result, he informed the Jews he could ensure their safety only if they accepted baptism. William Thomas Walsh, though unabashedly pro-Catholic, makes no apologies for crusaders who "massacred Jews, in the summer of 1096, at Trier, Worms, Mainz, Cologne—wherever they advanced along the Main and the Danube; and when they took Jerusalem, they soiled their victory by a hideous butchery of Jews." The Second Crusade, he says, "was marred by similar atrocities in Cologne, Mainz, Speyer, Strasbourg and elsewhere."[34] Even Jewish historians, though, defend the bishops. "The Jewish chroniclers" Glick says, "speak bitterly of the bishop and the townspeople of Worms, all of whom they blame for the catastrophe, but modern historians have concluded that nothing more could have been done."[35]

The situation in Worms highlights a salient fact. The conflict with the Jews was not based on race; it was based on behavior. The segregation between Jew and Christian during the previous millennium broke down when large segments of the superfluous agricultural workforce began settling in the cities and looking for jobs. The rootless proletariat that made up the crusading armies was upset with what they perceived to be Jewish behavior. If not, they would not have attacked them. All threat of violence usually ceased upon conversion, demonstrating the absence of racial animus. If the animus were racial, conversion would not have solved the problem. The Jewish issue was a religious issue, first and foremost; the mob assumed behavior would change when religion changed.

Jewish historiography, beginning with Heinrich Graetz, is a fertile source on the behavior of the Catholic Church during the Middle Ages, but it has distorting premises—some articulated, some not. The articulated premise of Jewish historiography is, in Norman Cantor's formulation, that "the Catholic Church was the most persistent fount of anti-Semitism in the world,"[36] otherwise expressed as the claim that the core of Catholicism is anti-Semitism. The unarticulated premise is that anti-Semitism has nothing to do with Jewish behavior. Both dogmas mar Jewish scholarship, but not all Jews succumb to them. Cohn, for instance, recognized explicitly that Catholic

clergy divided along class and hierarchical lines when it came to treatment of the Jews. The lower clergy often encouraged the mob to attack the Jews, but the Jews would then invariably seek protection from the bishop. The term "clergy" is itself deceptive because the clerics who joined the mob were often just as rootless as the mob. As Cohn points out, the *prophetae* who egged the mobs on to violence against the Jews were usually monks who had left their monasteries and were under obedience to no one and followed nothing but their own passions. Once mob fury was unleashed on the Jews, the next victims were the local secular clergy, who often knew the Jews and sometimes protected them. The Jews' defender was invariably the local bishop, the only one with sufficient will and power—and often a fortress and soldiers—to oppose the crusaders.

The second and unarticulated premise of Jewish historiography—that anti-Semitism has nothing to do with Jewish behavior—plays an even greater role in shaping perceptions. The rise of the cities meant more commerce; more commerce meant more contact with Jews; more contact with Jews meant more conflict. Usury was the main point of contention. The slaughter of the Jews during spring 1096 was the reaction of the uprooted to Jewish messianic politics combined with the resentment against Jewish usury. Walsh does not impugn the motives of everyone who put on the sign of the Cross in the crusades, but notes the armies attracted "some fanatics, some criminals escaping from the law, some adventurers with no more belief in Christ than the Jews themselves had," and, most importantly, "some debtors eager to escape from the crushing burden of high interest."[37]

By mid-12th century, the time of the Second Crusade, usury was a serious social problem. "Extremely high interest rates and annual compounding," says Glick, had "led to crushing debt accumulations."[38] Glick cites a letter from Pope Innocent III complaining "bitterly that the Jews extort 'not only usury but usury upon usury'" (***non solum usuras sed usuras usurarum***), his term for compound interest.[39] Innocent complained about the clergy of France, "who were pawning everything from cathedral chalices to church-owned real estate."[40] Innocent could not look with indifference upon the prospect of Church possessions falling into Jewish hands. Ten years later, Innocent translated his fears into action at the Fourth Lateran Council. The problem was not new—two of the three Lateran councils convened in the 12th century condemned usury—but it was growing alarmingly, not unlike compound interest.

The problem was systemic, not easily solved by conciliar pronouncements. High interest rates and compounding are by their nature morally problematic. The Church, following prohibitions in the Hebrew scriptures, tried to deal with it by moral condemnation. Christians were prohibited from exacting usury, so Jews had the field to themselves, with all of the social odium that went with it. Ecclesiastical prohibition, however, has only a limited effect on behavior.

and in the 12th and 13th centuries, that prohibition was counterbalanced by the increasing contact between Christians and Jews made possible by the cities. Increased contact meant increased opportunity to borrow money, and that led to crushing indebtedness, and indebtedness led to the possibility of increased violence against the lender. If people deep in debt to credit card companies and paying 21 percent interest per annum knew that by burning down the house of the head of Visa they could eliminate their debts, they might understand the temptations faced by the medieval Christians in financial bondage to the Jews. Many of the financially naive borrowed from Jews to finance "immediate consumption, not productive enterprise."[41] Exorbitant interest and compounding led many to financial ruin. The Jews, Glick notes, were often guilty of "leading the least productive members of society into ruin by encouraging them to consume beyond their means."[42] The Jew could charge 40 percent interest compounded annually, insuring that his debtor would never get out of debt. In a situation like that the crusades, which promised suspension of payment on debt as a recruitment incentive, seemed like a godsend. But the crusaders would also remember the usury that compelled them to leave home when they arrived in Speyer and Mainz and saw the number of Jews living there. Again the problem was systemic:

> The connection with money was a condition of Jewish life, and money was the very substance of survival. But money was also the devil's own creation, and handling it with such intimacy only confirmed what the Gospel of John had declared: that Jews were truly children of the devil. With this in mind, one readily understands the pervasive sense of insecurity that came to characterize so much of European Jewish life, even into the 20th century.[43]

The Jews were often constrained to maintain high interest rates because the conditions of their survival were more political than economic. The Jews charged 40 percent interest to the average person for small sums so they could provide large sums to the lord of the land at lower interest rates. "Usury of such dimensions," Glick says,

> was inescapable if [the Jews] were to meet the lords' incessant demands for tax payments and low interest loans, but of course it meant that they soon had a reputation of greed and rapacity that confirmed everything said about them in the Gospels. Thus they were caught in a nasty trap: disliked and resented by the general populace because they did no visible work and seemed to flourish on the misfortunes of others; too weak to defend themselves, hence dependent on rapacious lords.[44]

The nobility was tempted to expel the Jews if they ceased to provide money, which could only be raised by exploiting the population at large. As a result, "Jews became pariahs."[45] Hated by the people who borrowed money that could never be paid back, the Jews were "helpless, in need of protection and

obliged to please their protectors" and the natural target for any prole revolution.[47] Usury thus allowed Jews to buy "official protection at the of public detestation."[47] Money-lending is "by its very nature a socially iso and isolating activity."[48] With each loan, the Jew's position became precarious because it engendered resentment. When the crusades su to suspend the laws of everyday life, moral inhibition was suspended especially when the crusaders came to towns where they were unkn strangers, and therefore not bound by custom imposed in native places, violence expressed the resentment.

The issue was moral not racial. If Jewish behavior caused the reaction matter how unjust, of the crusading mobs, Jewish behavior could solve problem. The purpose of the crusade, even from the distorted perspectiv Emicho, was conversion of the Jews, not their extermination. From the bish who protected the Jews to the mob that looted their houses and killed them all accepted the premise that baptism solved the problem.

Coerced baptism would create a more intractable problem, though No church authority accepted coercion as a justification for baptism. T Dominican philosopher and theologian Thomas Aquinas was very cle "Heathen and Jews," he wrote

> are by no means to be compelled, for belief is voluntary. Nevertheless, the faithful, if they are able, should compel them not to hinder the faith whether by their blasphemies or evil persuasions or even open persecutions. It is for this reason that Christ's faithful often wage war on infidels, not indeed for the purpose of forcing them to believe, because even were they to conquer them and take them captive, they should still leave them free to believe or not, but for the purpose of stopping them from obstructing the faith of Christ.[49]

The Church's position on coercion, as articulated by Aquinas and in Sicut *Judaeis non* never changed. Definitions of what constituted coercion, however did change over time. A Jew who did not object when the water was poured over his head was considered a Christian, even if there were a howling mob outside the church urging him on. Church authorities also were hemmed in by the theology of baptism, according to which the sacrament left an indelible mark on the soul. The issue had been resolved by St. Augustine in the Donatist crisis. Since no Christian could be rebaptized, no Christian could be unbaptized either. If the Jew accepted baptism, he was a Christian. He would not be harmed, even by marauding mobs that would have killed him if he hadn't converted, but he would be subjected to severe penalties if he attempted to revert to what the clerics referred to as the vomit of Judaism. The Jews were never subjected to the Inquisition. But those Jews, "*qui redeunt ad vomitum Judaysmi*," to use Bernard of Clairvaux's phrase, were, and the penalties could be severe.[50]

When Emicho and his crusaders arrived in Mainz on May 25, the pattern repeated itself. After Jewish community leaders paid the archbishop and a local count large sums of money, the Jews were granted refuge in their palaces. When the bishop's guards and the local constabulary proved incapable of defending his palace, the bishop fled to his estate in nearby Rudesheim, and the Jews were on their own when the mob swarmed into the palace to murder and pillage. "The Jews," according to Glick,

> turned first (as European Jews almost invariably have done) to men at the top: local bishops. . . . Jews turned repeatedly to these princes of the Church, and bishops consistently did their best to defend and protect Jews, even when this meant no inconsiderable danger to themselves. We envision Jews huddling terrified in cathedral courtyards, crowded for days on end in rooms of an archbishop's' palace, racing for their lives into a cathedral sacristy filled with crucifixes and chalices."[31]

"The bishops," Glick continues, "behave[d] with commendable, even astonishing, sympathy and generosity,"[32] even when they proposed conversion, because "with hindsight that advice seems well intended and reasonable. Had more Jews gone through the motions of conversion, they would have lived to return to Judaism within a year."[33]

On June 3, the crusaders arrived in Cologne, which is not on the route between Mainz and Jerusalem. There the pattern repeated itself with happier results. The Jews fled to the bishop for protection; the bishop saved them by arranging transport to neighboring villages.

Emicho never made it to the Holy Land; instead he continued his predations along the German-speaking world's major waterways for 20 years. In 1117, he got caught up in a battle with the Hungarians, in the course of which his army was destroyed, and he barely escaped with his life. Legend had him returning to live in the mountains near Worms. Long after his life must have ended, the people of the Rhineland still recounted stories of the "Emperor of the Last Days," and many of them anticipated his return as eagerly as their forebears had joined his army. Orthodox Catholic chroniclers were less enthusiastic and not shy about drawing moral lessons from Emicho's debacle in Hungary. Albert of Aix claimed the "hand of the Lord" struck down the marauding crusaders because they "had sinned by excessive impurity and fornication," and because they "had slaughtered the exiled Jews through greed of money, rather than for the sake of God's justice, although the Jews were opposed to Christ."[34] Jews should not be coerced because "The Lord is a just judge and orders no one willingly or under compulsion, to come under the yoke of the Catholic faith."[35]

Roughly one century after Emicho arrived at Speyer, Joachim of Fiore proposed a millennialist reading of the Scriptures that applied typology to the New Testament and that broke history into three ages based on the three persons

of the Trinity. The Age of the Father corresponded to the Old Testament. The Age of the Son commenced when Christ arrived on earth, but it was to be followed by the Age of the Spirit, the age then about to dawn, which would be the culmination of history. Joachim was condemned as a Judaizer, but Cohn sees him as "the inventor of the new prophetic system, which was to be the most influential one known to Europe until the appearance of Marxism." Joachim's theory of history was, as Cohn notes, "wholly irreconcilable with the Augustinian view that the Kingdom of God had been realized, so far as it ever could be realized on this earth, at the moment when the church came into being and that there never would be any Millennium but this." His theories were "carnal" and appealed to a population that never accepted their Messiah had died on a cross and that his kingdom was not of this world. Joachim's ideas of the three ages culminating in the "end of history" would recur in subsequent revolutionary or evolutionary philosophies: in Hegel; in Comte's ascent from the theological through the metaphysical to the scientific age; in Marx in the ascent from primitive communism through class society to the dictatorship of the proletariat, when history and class shall cease simultaneously; and in Neoconservatism, a derivative form of Trostkyism, according to which widespread acceptance of American values will bring about the "end of history." History has shown that "the route to the Millennium leads through massacre and terror,"[58] but Neoconservatism's appropriation of Joachim's paradigm shows revolutionaries are undeterred. The rise of Joachim of Fiore's philosophy of history is the strange fruit of the cross-fertilization that occurred in the medieval city.

The Rhineland, especially the lower Rhine and the adjacent Low Countries, would continue as a hotbed of revolution and Millennialism for more than four centuries following Emicho's death. Medieval millennialist messianic politics would reach its culmination in Muenster in 1533, when the Anabaptists under Johan Bokelzoon established their communist dictatorship there. After the Bishop of Cologne and his army drove out the Anabaptists, they drifted toward the Spanish Netherlands to places like Antwerp, where they linked up with Puritans from England and Jews from Spain as the seed from which the modern revolutionary movement would grow following the Iconoclast Rebellion of 1566.

On December 1, 1145, Pope Eugenius III, responding to a report that a Muslim army had overrun the principality of Edessa in what is now southeastern Turkey, called for a second crusade to protect Jerusalem from renewed attacks. As an incentive to enlistment, the pope promised crusaders remission of debts, spiritual and temporal. The pope offered a plenary indulgence and remission of all interest on debts and postponement of payment until the crusaders' return. "The King of France," according to Ephraim bar Jacob, "then allowed an order to be published to the effect that one who resolved to go to Jerusalem on the Crusade must be forgiven his debts to Jews. Most of the loans made by

French Jews, however, were made on mere credit; through this they lost their fortunes."[59]

The people interested in escaping the burden of debt were no friends to the Jews. When the crusaders arrived at the Rhine, the carnage that had taken place 50 years earlier was repeated. Just as 50 years before, the Jews turned to the local bishops, who then turned to one of the great figures of the middle ages, St. Bernard of Clairvaux. The archbishops of Mainz and Cologne wrote to Bernard asking for his assistance.

Bernard's task was not easy. Summoned in late summer 1146 from a preaching tour, he confronted open insurrection. In Mainz, he found the enormously popular renegade monk Rudolph at the head of a revolutionary mob intent on murdering the Jews. At great personal risk, Bernard confronted Rudolph, denouncing him as a renegade against the rule of monks and as a man who presumed to preach on his own authority while wandering the globe under obedience to no one in violation of his solemn vows. Bernard's courage and eloquence induced Rudolph to return to his monastery. The people of Mainz were ready to take up arms and rebel despite Rudolph's obedience; they were only restrained, says Synan, "by the consideration of [Bernard's] sanctity."[60]

Bernard thus prevented further slaughter of Jews and nipped the millennialist revolution in the bud. Nevertheless, "Bernard," Glick says, "was no friend of the Jew,"[61] because "his sermons and letters are replete with anti-Jewish invective."[62] Glick adds that Bernard "insisted always that Jews had to be dealt with humanely and permitted to live" but his accusation of anti-Semitism remains.[63] Cantor links Bernard and Anselm of Canterbury as members of a generation "who moved Catholic thought in a new direction" that was implicitly more anti-Semitic,[64] but there was nothing new about Bernard. His critique of the Jews is the same as the Church's position, reiterated since Augustine and codified by Pope Gregory the Great in *Sicut Judaeis non*. Jews, according to Catholic teaching, are carnal and blind. Not even the wonders Jesus performed could overcome their blindness. Bernard notes:

> Not the flight of demons, nor the obedience of the elements, nor life restored to the dead, was able to expel from their minds that bestial stupidity, and more than bestial, which caused them, by a blindness as marvelous as it was miserable, to rush headlong into that crime, so enormous and so horrible, of laying impious hands upon the Lord of Glory.[65]

Nonetheless, "the Jews are not to be persecuted, killed or even put to flight" because "the Jews are for us the living words of Scripture, for they remind us always of what our Lord suffered. They are dispersed all over the world so that by expiating their crime they may be everywhere the living witnesses of our redemption."[66] Aware Jews might complain about being characterized as

"ox-like," Bernard offers only the words of scripture, in particular Isaiah, [illegible] goes farther than Bernard because where "I put you on a par with the be[illegible] he puts you beneath them."[67] Jews are blind: "Jewish disbelief is a night, a[illegible] night too, is the fleshy or bestial way of life led by Catholics."[68] Catholics [illegible] engaged in usury "played the Jew" to their co-religionists.[69]

None of this rhetoric was calculated to endear Bernard to the Jews, b[illegible] none of it was new either. Bernard praised those Christians who "wish [illegible] go forth against the Ishmaelites," but he warned them "whoever touche[illegible] Jew so as to lay hands on his life, does something sinful as if he laid han[illegible] on Jesus himself."[70] The Jewish chronicler Ephraim bar Jacob mentio[illegible] Bernard's denunciation of Rudolph, his disciple, for in speaking against th[illegible] Jews "to exterminate them," Rudolph "has preached only unrighteousnes[illegible] Whenever the Jews promoted violence against Christians, then Bernard held it would be right to match force with force in self-defense.

The Third Lateran Council in 1179 passed resolutions on the Jews, many of which were, as Synan notes, "already traditional policy of many years' standing."[72] Jews were not to possess Christian slaves and servants—specifically neither nurses nor midwives. Compulsion was not to be used to convert Jews, but sincere converts to Judaism were to be received without calumny. Jews were to suffer neither in their persons nor in their goods, apart from lawful trial and sentence; no one was to disturb their religious ceremonials. They were not to drag clerics before secular judges, and Christians could give testimony against Jews in court trials; "to give preference to Jewish witnesses fell under the penalty of excommunication. . . . Jews were not to obtain control over Christian churches, to the contempt of God and the loss of revenue [and] . . . feudal homage could not be sworn to a Jew." The long constitution in which most of these provisions occur is the oldest extant form of what would later become *Sicut Judaeis non,* the Church's statement on the Jews.[73]

The statements of the Third Lateran Council reiterate the traditional critique of the Jews, who are "clinging to a stage of faith long since rendered obsolete by the mercy of God, to which they had been blind. The kernel," in a stereotyped metaphor, "remained hidden from the Jews under the shell which is the letter of the sacred text."[74] *Sicut Judaeis non* was the essence of Christian realism and Christian charity. No Christian should harm a Jew but Jews should be excluded from positions of cultural influence. Jewish converts are to be accepted "without calumny":

> No Christian is to compel an unwilling Jew by force to accept baptism, but the Jew who freely manifests a desire for baptism is to be christened "without calumny." Apart from lawful judicial sentences, no Christian is wickedly to injure their persons or violently to confiscate their possessions; no one is to change the good customs they have in any given religion. No one is to disturb their rest with clubs and stones. . . and no one is

> to attempt to extract from Jews service unsanctioned by custom. Their cemeteries and the bodies therein, are to be respected.[75]

This protection shields only those Jews innocent of plotting to subvert the Christian faith. Glick incorrectly attributes the first utterance of *Sicut Judaeis non* to 1120, but correctly states the principle behind it:

> just as Jews must not over step their bounds, so Christians must not arbitrarily mistreat them. Although Jewish faithlessness must be condemned, it begins, the Jews must not be unjustly oppressed. Although they persist in their obstinacy and refuse to understand the mysteries of their own scriptures, Christian charity demands that they be granted papal protection. Thus they are not to be forced into baptism; nor may they be injured, robbed, or persecuted in any manner. No one is to desecrate their cemeteries, or to exhume and plunder bodies. Those who violate these prohibitions are to be subject to excommunication unless they make proper amends. *But, the edict concludes, the Church extends protection only to those Jews who have not plotted to subvert the Christian faith.*[76]

According to Glick, "the essential message here was forbearance. Jews were to be peacefully encouraged to see the light, but until they did so of their own free will they were to be tolerated, preserved as a form of testament to Christian truth."[77] Jews, according to his reading of *Sicut Judaeis non*, were permitted to live in their own manner until they recognized their error and entered the ranks of the redeemed.

As the italicized passage indicates, forbearance is a two-way street. Only those Jews "who have not plotted to subvert the Christian faith" were worthy of toleration. If Jews were plotting subversion, then all bets were off. That is precisely what happened during the course of the 13th century with 1) the Talmud and the discovery of 2) Jewish involvement in support of heretical movements like the Albigensians in France.

Jewish historians treat Christian anti-Semitism (as opposed to anti-Judaism) as so obvious that no proof is necessary; the only question is did the Church become more anti-Semitic during the 13th century, or did it remain as anti-Semitic as it always had been? Jewish historiography breaks down into two schools, both of which view the Church adversely. Norman Cantor maintains that nothing changed from the time of Bernard to the Second Vatican Council. The one constant of European history was the Catholic Church's anti-Semitism. Cantor claims, "in the revered Bernard's preaching on the Jewish question" one finds

> the central and authentic voice of the Catholic Church. Nothing changed fundamentally in the Catholic Church's hatred for the Jews and the teaching of contempt and fury against them between the twelfth-century and the Second Vatican Council of 1965. *In all that time the Catholic*

> *Church was the most persistent fount of anti-Semitism in the world. The* are different *now*, but the truth about the old days, these long, [illegible] centuries of Jew hatred must not be forgotten."

Cantor ignores Bernard's risking of his own life to save the lives of in Mainz. He also ignores the split between higher and lower clergy Cohn sees as essential to understanding the reality of revolutionary Not only does the confrontation between Bernard and the renegade Rudolph go unmentioned, Cantor even makes Bernard accountable Rudolph's behavior, claiming "ecclesiastics" like Bernard "hated Jews spewed hostility toward them that was bound to echo through all the ra the hierarchy, down to the level of parish priest and simplest monk." though, shows that the mob invariably also attacked the local clergy, and the Jews invariably sought protection from the local bishop. Bernard th Jews were blind and carnal, but he defended them against the millennia a group of anti-Semitic Judaizers, who were as anticlerical as they were Semitic. As a result, many clergy perished at the hands of the eschatolog inspired hordes:

> Any chiliastic movement was in fact almost compelled by the situation in which it found itself to see the clergy as a demonic fraternity. A group of laymen headed by a messianic leader and convinced that it was charged by God with the stupendous mission of preparing the way for the Millennium—such a group was bound to find in the institutionalized Church at best an intransigent opponent, at worst a ruthless persecutor.[7]

Cantor, who sees the first crusade as "the beginning of the downfall Ashkenaz," ignores this fact to dispute the claim that Catholic anti-Semitism

> was something marginal, extraneous, disseminated by unruly and underliterate people. No, anti-Semitism lay at the center of medieval Christian sensibility. It was at the core of medieval Christian sensibility and the vanguard literary culture of that day. Blood libel, King Arthur and the Round Table: they were jointly integral to the medieval ethos, inseparably bound together in the structure of the medieval imagination. The child-killing Jew and Sir Lancelot were equally fixtures of the medieval mind and embedded inextricably in the same romantic culture.[8]

To him, the Rhineland pogroms expressed the essential nature of Christianity not an anti-Christian, anticlerical aberration opposed by the higher clergy Cantor's inability to distinguish between the Church's traditional anti-Judaism as manifested in St. Bernard's sermons and *Sicut Judaeis non* and the revolutionary chiliasm Bernard opposed, renders his treatment of the era increasingly and unnecessarily opaque.

The other school of Jewish historiography isn't much better. According to Jeremy Cohen, something changed in Christian-Jewish relations during the

13th century. Things went from bad to worse. The evidence supports Cohen more than it supports Cantor. Something did change then, but it was not the Church's teaching. Rather, the Church's image of the Jew changed. The traditional view—the Jew is a blind, carnal Israelite as at the time of Christ—was replaced by a new understanding which saw him as a social revolutionary and outlaw. This change in perception occurred for two reasons: 1) because of the conflict with the Albigensians in southern France and 2) because of the discovery of the Talmud.

This change in the Church's perception of the Jew did not call into question the principle of *Sicut Judaeis non*, but it changed how that principle would be applied. Cantor's adherence to the two pillars of Jewish historiography blinds him to the changes. According to Cantor, the "New Piety" of the 11th and 12th centuries was created by men—Pope St. Gregory VII and Cardinal St. Peter Damiani, one of his main associates, St. Anselm of Canterbury, a theologian and monastic leader; and St. Bernard of Clairvaux, theologian, preacher and mystic—who all "hated Jews."[82] Cantor says that "these ecclesiastics stood at the pinnacle of power in the Western church of their day and were the re-creators of medieval Christianity along the lines of a deeper and more personal sensibility. They also hated Jews and spewed hostility toward them that was bound to echo through all the ranks of the hierarchy, down to the level of parish priest and simplest monk."[83]

The situation changed dramatically when Innocent III became pope in 1198. The supreme pontiff declared war on heretics at home and infidels abroad, and one might add, the infidels at home, the Jews, after inheriting "a Church that had been sliding ominously in efficiency and esteem."[84] When Innocent III became pope, "the status of European Jews was radically altered, and the policy of the Church became imbued with an increasingly aggressive and polemical spirit. The war against the heretics of Languedoc included the Jewries of the cities involved and it was not long before 'the crusade against the Albigensians led to the crusade against the Jews.'"[85]

During his pontificate, the Orders of Dominican and Franciscan Friars came into prominence as auxiliaries of the Church. The Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 enacted measures against Jews and heretics, and the newly created mendicant orders, in particular the Dominicans, were assigned to implement them. The Dominicans were largely responsible for the attack on the Talmud; for establishment of the Inquisition; and, implemented under the direction of Dominican General St. Raymond of Penafort, for the campaign of converting the Jews over the next two centuries.

By 1200 the Albigensians and the Waldensians were firmly established in Lombardy and Languedoc. In 1204, Innocent III dispatched Diego de Acebes, the bishop of Osma, to preach among the Cathari in Languedoc. The rise of the new mendicant orders followed as the Church employed them to fight heterodoxy. Unlike the Benedictines, bound to a place by the rule of Benedict,

the Dominicans and the Franciscans moved around to fight heresy wher
it emerged. When Dominic died in 1221, his order was working through
Europe and on the way to creating the Inquisition to combat heresy
subversion. In 1209 St. Francis of Assisi presented his rule to Innocent
for approval, also placing his order at the Church's disposal to fight here
When Francis died in 1226, Cohen says, "his order was already a perman
institution of the Church and like the Dominicans, an elite clerical force
the service of Rome."[86]

The rise of the mendicants responded to a growing serious threat. In 11
Pope Lucius III told each diocese to campaign against heresy in his decre
Ad abolendam. Fifteen years later Innocent III labeled heresy "the worst
possible" because it was "far more serious to attack the eternal majesty than th
temporal."[87] Concerned about Albigensianism in southern France, Innoce
sent special legates there to prosecute heresy. The mendicants quickly engage
European Jewry because Jews were consistently supporting heresy to subver
the social order in Christian Europe. As soon as the Dominicans entere
England, they opened a priory in the heart of the Jewish quarter in Oxford.

When Saint Dominic arrived in Languedoc, he found "widespread
contempt for the clergy," due, Walsh notes, to "the incessant propaganda
of Jews, Saracens and heretics," and "the luxurious and easy living of some
of the priests themselves, and sometimes by notorious scandals among
them."[88] The Waldensians and Albigensians were "communists of a sort"
who held "unconventional views of sexual morality."[89] "The Waldenses prais
continency to their believers," said Bernard Gui, "yet they grant that one
ought to satisfy a burning lust by any manner of shamefulness whatsoever
their apostles explaining this by saying it is better to marry than burn (*Melius
est nubere quam uri*), for it is better, they say, to satisfy lust by any act of shame
whatsoever than to be tempted in the heart within; this, however, they keep
very secret indeed."[90] In attacking marriage, the Cathars attacked the very
foundation of the social order.

Walsh insists the Inquisition never proceeded against the Jews, "either on
racial grounds as Jews, or on religious grounds as members of the synagogue."
The Jews came under the purview of the Inquisition for aiding heretics and for
converting and then relapsing. Cohen concurs but says the Church's attitude,
even as articulated by Thomas Aquinas, "facilitated attacks upon Jews":

> First, Jews were often accused of promoting heretical ideals and giving aid to heretics. Although such ties may indeed have existed in Languedoc and Lombardy, the charges of the Inquisition were undoubtedly much exaggerated; even the anti-Jewish Cathari were accused of using Judaism as a cover for spreading their own ideas. Second, both Christian converts to Judaism and Jewish converts to Christianity who "relapsed" into their former religion came under the jurisdiction of the Inquisition, as did by

> extension those Jews who consorted with the converts and *relapsi* in their practice of Judaism.[92]

Since Cohen admits Jews promoted heresy, how can he object to measures taken against them on these grounds? The measures he mentions were preventative, aimed not at persecuting or annihilating Jews but rather at protecting the Christian social order. The Church strove

> first to prevent Jews form aiding and associating with Christian heretics; second, to eliminate from Christian life every trace of Jewish literary influence emanating from those writings, particularly in the domain of the Talmud and Rabbinical literature, alleged to be injurious to Christian faith; third, to curtail any personal proselytizing by Jews or Jewish communities . . . fourth, to prevent Jews who had accepted Christianity by baptism from reverting to Judaism, accompanied by their own families and by Christians upon whom they had provided lies with which to desert the Catholic Church.[93]

Complaints against the Jews grew throughout the 13th century. In a letter written on June 6, 1299, Philip the Fair complained that Jews "receive fugitive heretics and conceal them."[94] Jews "received into their homes and hid from the investigation and pursuit of the Holy Office, not only judaizing Christian Jews, namely the converts from Judaism to Christianity who had relapsed, but also Christian dissenters, whether Albigensian, Waldensian or members of any other contemporary party under the ban of the Church."[95] One Jewish historian explains "it was only natural that one group, exiled from society because of religious difference should seek the friendship and protection of another group likewise banned."[96] The Jews "carried on a continuous and effective propaganda" throughout Christendom, "which, while it persisted, was bound to make impossible the complete Christianizing of society."[97] Saying this is "freely admitted" by Jewish scholars,[98] Walsh then cites I. Abrahams, who claims that as a rule, "heresy was a reversion to Old Testament and even Jewish ideals. It is indubitable that the heretical doctrines of the southern French Albigenses in the beginning of the thirteenth-century, as of the Hussites in the Fifteenth, were largely the result of friendly intercourse between Christians and Jews."[99] Cohen claims the newly founded mendicants used Jewish association with heretics as an excuse to harass the Jews, but the association was there nonetheless. Walsh claims "if the Jews had confined their activities to the synagogue and their allegiance to the Law of Moses, a great deal of conflict and even bloodshed might have been avoided."[100]

The prosecution of heresy in Languedoc must have been effective because in 1208 the papal legate there was murdered. Raymond of Toulouse was held responsible, and Innocent, in response, preached a crusade to liberate the area from heresy. In 1209, an army assembled at Lyon and then marched southward, engaging in indiscriminate slaughter; when a soldier asked how

to tell heretics from Catholics, he was told to slaughter them all and let God sort them out. The struggle outlasted Innocent's papacy, coming to something of a conclusion in 1229 with the signing of the treaty of Paris (of Meaux). In 1271 Languedoc became part of the French royal domain under Philippe III Le Hardi. In 1244 Catholic forces stormed Montsegur, which had harbored men who murdered Dominican preachers, and burned 200 heretics at the stake without trial. After Raymond of Toulouse was flogged publicly in 1229 for employing Jews and heretics at his court, he swore to obey injunctions dictated by the papal legate, one of which ordered him "to remove the Jews from the administration of public and private affairs in all your lands" and never "to restore them to the same or to other offices, nor to take any Jews for any administrative office, nor ever to use their advice against Christians."[101]

In 1204, Moses Maimonides, champion of Jewish scholasticism, died without establishing a coherent relationship between faith and reason of the sort that Aquinas would bequeath to Christendom. "Maimonides's failure to achieve a socially approved synthesis of science and Halakic Judaism" meant the rise of irrationalism and the occult in Jewish thought. As a result, "the orthodox rabbis" never attempted another synthesis of faith and reason, turning instead "to the soft theosophy of the Cabala."[102] That turning to irrational occultism was most pronounced in southern France, known as Judaea Secunda, the area where Albigensianism took root. More than one Jewish historian traces Albigensianism to Jewish influence. "Some of the Cathari of Leon," we are told, "used to circumcise themselves, so that they might propagate heresy as 'Jews.'" "If the truth were known," says Lewis Browne, "probably it would be found that the learned Jews in Provence were in large part responsible for this free-thinking sect. The doctrines that the Jews had been spreading throughout the land for years could not but have helped to undermine the Church's power." Another modern Jewish writer goes further, considering it "indubitable" that the heretical doctrines of Southern France "were largely the result of friendly intercourse between Christians and Jews."[103]

Louis Israel Newman claimed Jews were active in "Christian Reform Movements," i.e., heresies, throughout European history beginning with the Albigensians and Waldensians, and that heresy often meant judaizing, "the policy of imitation of Jewish ideas, practices, and customs which many Christians professed."[104] The Waldensians were, according to Newman, Judaizers, "indviduals or groups who, as in Lombardy, adopted a Jewish outlook on life, and Jewish forms of ceremony and conduct."[105] Heresies are judaizing because, says Newman, "in almost every period of Christian Reform a return to the simple interpretation of the biblical word has played an important role in the rejection of established orthodox doctrines. The Waldensian, Hussite, Wycliffe, Lutheran, Puritan and modern Protestant movements have been accompanied by a reversion to the sources of Christian faith," i.e., the Old Testament in its chiliastic revolutionary meaning.[106] that

judaizing would reach its peak "during the Puritan Renaissance," when "the center of gravity among many scholars and believers shifted from the Gospels to the Jewish Bible."[107]

Pope Innocent III soon was upset about "Jewish insolence" as much as about Jewish usury. The Jews, he wrote to the bishop of Paris in 1205, were

> so insolent that they hurl unbridled insults at the Christian faith, insults which it is an abomination not only to utter but even to keep in mind. Thus, whenever it happens that on the day of the Lord's Resurrection the Christian women who are nurses for the children of Jews take in the body and blood of Jesus Christ, the Jews make these women pour their milk into the latrine for three days before they again give suck to the children. Besides, they perform other detestable and unheard of things against the Catholic faith, as a result of which the faithful should fear that they are incurring divine wrath when they permit the Jews to perpetuate unpunished such deeds as bring confusion upon our faith."[108]

Jews, he reminded the bishops of northern France, "are consigned to perpetual servitude because they crucified the Lord" and dwell among Christians only on sufferance; therefore they "ought not be ungrateful to us, and not requite Christian favor with contumely and intimacy with contempt."[109] The Jews, thus, were not simply following the Old Testament and minding their own business; they were deliberately provoking their Christian hosts. The Jews at Sens had built a synagogue "more lofty than the venerable local church."[110] Jewish cantors raised such a clamor that they disturbed the worshippers in the adjacent church. The Jews of Sens were also blasphemers, referring to Christ as "a mere rustic, gibbeted by the Jewish people."[111] The list went on: on Good Friday, contrary to ancient law and custom, the Jews had taken to rioting through the streets and squares, ridiculing Christians for adoring One nailed to a cross, and this in the hope of diverting Christians from their religious obligations. The Jews were accused of leaving their gates unlocked until midnight for the convenience of thieves.[112] No one, Innocent concluded, "ever succeeded in recovering stolen property" from Jews.[113]

Innocent makes the traditional criticism of Jews. Jews are carnal because "the Mosaic Law promised temporal and earthly delights, a land flowing with milk and honey, the law of the talon, conjugal joy, and a numerous progeny."[114] The Christian Gospel is more spiritual because it "extols poverty, invokes a blessing in answer to a curse, venerates virginity."[115] "The carnal Jews," can only follow "what sense perceives." They differ from their own prophets, who "spoke not carnally, but spiritually." Because they have the word of God in the Torah, Jews are culpable; the Jew of Innocent's time differ from the Israelites before Christ, because some of the Israelites accepted Christ when he came, but all Jews of Innocent's time reject Him. Rejecting Christ was "blindness," which could be an involuntary fault. Even so, Innocent was unwilling to

excuse Jewish disbelief on the ground of ignorance: "The Jew who d... that Messiah has come, and that he is God, lies. . . . Herod is the devil... Jews demons; that one is King of the Jews, this one the King of demons." The Lord "condemned the Synagogue because of her disbelief, and chose... Church because of her obedience."[117] The "Synagogue has reason enough... envy: Her most precious possessions have been inherited by the Church... All this Hebrew wealth is now in the hands of the Church. The Jews... burdened with "perfidia" which meant bad faith rather than treachery. So... Church continued to pray for the Synagogue "that God might remove the ... from Jewish hearts, that she might acknowledge who is Truth."[119] The issue... as Innocent frames it, is behavior, not race. Innocent "never forgot that Jesus... was a Jew,"[120] which meant everything bad about the Jews could be changed... by conversion, which he saw as a labor of love, bringing those with darkened... minds to the Truth:

> For we make the law that no Christian compel them, unwilling or refusing, by violence to come to baptism. But if any one of them should spontaneously, and for the sake of the faith, fly to the Christians, once his choice has become evident, let him be made a Christian without any calumny. Indeed, he is not considered to possess the true faith of Christianity who is recognized to have come to Christian baptism, not spontaneously, but unwillingly.[121]

Jewish historians rarely portray conversion to Christianity that way. Heinrich Graetz, founder of modern Jewish historiography, describes Innocent III as "the first pope who directed against the Jews the burning fury and inhuman severity of the Church." Graetz never mentions Innocent's reaffirmation of *Sicut Judaeis non*. If he had he could not have claimed "only a delusive hope restrained [Innocent III] from openly preaching a crusade and a war of annihilation" against the Jews.[122]

Innocent III never questioned *Sicut Judaeis non*, the Church's traditional teaching on the Jews, a doctrine then 600 years old: "Just as, therefore, there ought not to be license for the Jews to presume to go beyond what is permitted them by law in their synagogues, so in those which have been conceded to them, they ought to suffer no prejudice."[123] Innocent insisted that the papacy grant Jews "the buckler of Our protection." They were to be safe in life and limb; and, "in the celebration of their own festivities, no one ought to disturb them in any way," nor should any Christian "dare mutilate or diminish a Jewish cemetery, nor, in order to get money, to exhume bodies once they have been buried." If any Christian did so, he was to "be punished by the vengeance of excommunication."[124]

This protection was, of course, conditional, applying only to Jews who did not plot to subvert the Christian faith.[125] The caveat is in Innocent's condemnation of blasphemous Jewish behavior on Good Friday, when

"Jews, contrary to ancient custom, publicly run through streets and squares, congregating and everywhere deriding Christians for adoring in the customary way the Crucified on His cross, and by their improprieties strive to recall these from their duty to adore."[126] It is implicit in his condemnation of Jewish trafficking in stolen goods. "Blasphemers of the Christian Name," Innocent III said "ought not to be coddled at the price of oppressing the Lord's servants, but rather be repressed by the servitude of which they have rendered themselves deserving when they laid sacrilegious hands on Him who had come to confer true liberty upon them, calling down His blood upon themselves and on their children too [Matt 27: 25]."[127] Innocent criticizes "certain secular princes" who "receive Jews in their manors and town in order that they might set them up as their own again for the exacting of usury, and who are not ashamed to afflict the churches of God and the poor of Christ."[128] As a result, "widows and orphans are despoiled of their inheritances, and churches are defrauded of their tithes and other customary income because Jews, who disdain to respond to the prelates of those churches on parochial right, hold castles and manors."[129] Jews were coming into possession of Church property through usury, and they were using their economic power to exert pernicious cultural influence over those who owed them money. They were abusing the conditions under which they were tolerated in Christian states, and the state was well within its powers to put a stop to the abuse.

Innocent III, however, did not preach a crusade against the Jews; he preached one against Albigensians. In confusing the two, Graetz shows that Innocent's concern about the connection between Jewish insolence and Jewish support of heresy was not unfounded. Innocent, Graetz tells us,

> was well aware why he so thoroughly abhorred Jews and Judaism. He hated those among them who indirectly agitated against the rotten form of Christianity, upon which the papacy had built its power. The aversion of the truly God-fearing and moral Christians to the arrogance, unchastity, and insatiable covetousness of the hierarchy had in some measure been prompted by the Jews. *The Albigenses in southern France, who were branded as heretics. and who were the most resolute opponents of the papacy, had imbibed their hostility from intercourse with educated Jews.* Amongst the Albigenses there was a sect which unhesitatingly declared the Jewish law preferable to that of Christians. The eye of Innocent was, therefore, directed to the Jews of the south of France as well as to the Albigenses, in order to check their influence on the minds of the Christians. Count Raymund VI of Toulouse and St. Gilles . . . who was looked upon as a friend of the Albigenses, and consequently cruelly harassed, was also credited by the Pope with favoring the Jews [my emphasis].[130]

Innocent's animus toward the Jews was, as we have seen, not motivated by anti-Semitism but instead by Jewish behavior, specifically, usury, insolence,

blasphemy, and support for heretical sects subverting the social, moral, and political order. Innocent III and subsequent popes reevaluated their understanding of who and what the Jews were, gradually replacing the idea of them as blind and carnal with a new understanding of them as revolutionary, threatening the social and political order of Christendom. "The Cathars," one historian has noted, "were hardly as harmless as Graetz portrays them." The people Graetz portrays as "the truly God-fearing and moral Christians" regarded "a pregnant woman as possessed by a devil, and, if she died in childbirth, certain to go to Hell." The Cathars were a secret society; they were, Umberto Eco points out in *Foucault's Pendulum*, the predecessors of the Freemasons, a group which "would resort to every subterfuge and hypocrisy to conceal their true beliefs." Their refusal to take oaths undermined feudal society as much as their attitude toward sexuality threatened to depopulate it. Perversion was, in their eyes, preferable to marriage. And their fast unto death, the endura, "cost more lives than the Inquisition ever did."[132]

Unlike Graetz, Cantor does not play down the threat Albigensianism posed to 13th century Europe. Nor does he portray the life-denying Cathars as "truly God-fearing and moral Christians." The papacy, says Cantor, "faced a real crisis in the early 13th century" when "Catharism revived the old Manichean dualist doctrine."[133] The Inquisition's job was not to exterminate heretics, "but rather to persuade and frighten suspected deviants back into the church." The defendant had to be recalcitrant or a triple recidivist to be "turned over to the secular arm,"[135] that is, the state, for burning. The Inquisition did not fish for Jews even though, as Cantor maintains, "The Jews were not entirely innocent victims within the religious structure of southern France, nor was the inquisitorial friars' attack on them idiosyncratic and fortuitous."[136]

Unlike Graetz, who turns the Jews into cynical manipulators of the Albigensians, Cantor claims the Jews succumbed to the Jewish version of the same error, namely, Cabala. "The Jewish community of Provence was the place where the Cabala started."[137] Vehemently rejecting Maimonides' attempts at rationalism, the rabbis of Provence succumbed to a "pastiche of mysticism, demonology, and astrology that came eventually to be called the Cabala."[138] The Zohar, the definitive cabalistic text, would not be written for another century, "but its origins lie in Provence in the early 13th century, precisely at the same time as the flourishing of the Catharist heresy."[139] Citing Gershom Scholem, Cantor claims "Cabala was a late continuation or revival of ancient Jewish Gnosticism." Gnosticism was "hermetic among the Jews" as it was in freemasonry, the English Protestant appropriation of Cabala, "but blatantly separatist among the Christians. . . . it surfaced at the same time and in the same place, southern France, among both Christians and Jews. In the case of the Christians it takes the form of Catharism; among the Jews, of Cabalism."[140] When Gnosticism first appeared in the ancient world, "the Gnostic community was the greatest internal threat that Christianity faced

in the first two centuries of its existence."[141] It was no less a threat in the 13th century.

Innocent convoked the Fourth Lateran Council to deal with the threat forcefully and directly. That Council was the fullest expression of Christendom, i.e., the integration of Church and State, Europe would see. Five of its edicts dealt with Jews. Two addressed the problem of "heavy and immoderate" usury, suggesting "Jews were still providing essential capital at high rates of interest and gaining ownership of valuable properties when debtors defaulted."[142] Another specified, "men are not to be charged interest while away on crusade."[143] Another repeats the injunction against appointing those "who blaspheme against Christ" to public office, "since this offers them the pretext to vent their wrath against the Christians."[144] The fifth addressed how to deal with converts who appear insincere.

According to one historian, the first paragraph of the Fourth Lateran's Canon 68 initiated "a new era in European Jewish history," by specifying that henceforth all Jews "shall be readily distinguishable from everyone else by their type of clothing"[145] to guard unsuspecting Christians against intercourse with Jews. In 1221, Innocent's successor, Pope Honorius III, informed the bishops of Bordeaux province that he had heard that some Jews in the region "scorn to wear the prescribed signs by which they are able to be distinguishable from Christians . . . That Christians mingle [*commiscentur*] with Jewish women, and Jews wickedly mingle with Christian women."[146]

Cantor traces the roots of Canon 68 to the Albigensian crisis:

> The attack upon the Jews by the papal inquisitors—and Pope Innocent III's determination at the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 to segregate the Jews from Christian society—was due not only to general cultural and social developments but also especially to the Jewish Gnostic involvement in the rise of Catharism. *The Jews were therefore not entirely passive victims.* When the inquisitorial friars went after them, there was an immediate cause [my emphasis].[147]

This is an atypical take on the Lateran Council's edicts on the Jews. More typical is the assertion that the Jews were to wear distinctive clothing because "they were to be treated as pariahs in society."[148] And they were treated as pariahs as a first step: "After this blow, it was just a matter of time before the Jews would be massacred or expelled." Louis IX, according to this view, was "the ideal monarch in the eyes of European society" and as such "a vitriolic hater of the Jews, intent on humiliating them and removing whatever shred of dignity, prosperity and protection remained from the glorious days of Charlemagne."[149] According to Cohen, the culmination of "the new Piety" otherwise known as the new anti-Semitism, "was institutionalized in the early 13th century with the creation of two new religious orders of friars, the

Dominicans and the Franciscans. . . . Conversion of the Jews became one of their favorite projects."[150]

Taken together, the papacy of Innocent III and the death of Maimonides constituted, according to one historian, "the very nadir of Jewish fortunes." These "twin disasters" stood at the midpoint of the trajectory that began with Emicho of Leiningen and ended with the disappearance of the Ashkenazim from Western Europe. The sense of Jewish woe is heightened rather than ameliorated because this was not a campaign of extermination but of conversion. The Jews saw annihilation and conversion as essentially the same thing.[152] But even Cantor is constrained to note that the mendicants' desire to convert the Jews "is not the voice of the Nazi Holocaust" because "the Nazis would give the Jews no escape from their doom, but the Catholic church always left the door open to Jewish conversion and escape."[153]

No pope, however, could view conversion to Christianity as annihilation. The popes were constrained by their faith to view it otherwise: those who were blind could now see; those who were spiritually dead had come back to life. It was cause for rejoicing. In the medieval Church, one is struck by the remorselessness of their logic and their simplicity in responding to the alternatives that confronted them.

The Church seemed to be faced with two equally repugnant choices: either allow Jewish subversion of Christian culture through usury, blasphemy, and covert support of heresy, or allow the people affected most by it to resolve it violently. Doing nothing would have entailed choosing both options in dialectic fashion, which is to say, the former leading to the latter. The Church, however, applied the principle of *Sicut Judaeis non* as the only viable alternative to Jewish subversion on the one hand and mob mayhem on the other. No one should harm the Jew, the popes taught, nor should his conversion be forced. If a Jew wanted to persist willfully in his blindness, he should be allowed the opportunity to celebrate his religious rites, but a Jew should be allowed no cultural influence, because experience had shown he used it to subvert faith and morals. The Jew was an enemy of Christ and an enemy of Christendom, but Christians were always taught to love their enemies.

The simplest way to prevent this enemy from destroying the social order while also protecting him from the unruly mob was to work for the Jews' conversion. And this is precisely what the Church did. The mendicant orders studied Hebrew and Arabic and read the sacred writings of the Jews to understand them better. This approach bore fruit. Jews converted in significant numbers toward the end of the 13th century, and when they did, they brought insider's information with them and shared it with those in authority in the Church.

In 1292 the Jewish congregation in Apulia in Italy disappeared because, as one Jewish historian puts it, "the friars succeeded in harassing the Jews sufficiently so that most accepted baptism."[154] A manuscript in the Vatican

Library confirms the conversion of a great number of Apulian Jews by Bartolomeo and two colleagues in 1292. And Neapolitan documents dating from 1294. . . reveal that 1,300 Jewish families in Apulia have converted—probably a total of at least 8,000 proselytes. Other contemporary sources relate that many Jews fled from Apulia at this time, causing the Jewish community in at least some cities to vanish completely."[155] The Hebrew chronicler Solomon ibn Verga wrote "Some were forced to convert . . . and the rest departed for distant lands."[156] Sincere conversion to Christianity is an oxymoron for Jewish historians, but even they concede "the inquisitorial endeavor achieved success during the last decade of the 13th century." The historical record indicates most conversions were sincere, which is to say, not forced. When a group of Jews converted in Naples in 1290, Charles II granted their request "to have a synagogue building. . . given to them for use as a church." When all of the Jews in Salerno converted, the Dominicans sold the building and "used the proceeds to aid impoverished converts."[157]

Innocent III had claimed the Church was the ruler of the Jews in the lands of Christendom. Jews perhaps felt the same way: Abraham of Montpellier wrote to Gregory IX in 1232 and asked him to ban Maimonides. Unable to resolve their internal disputes, the Jews turned to the Church—in particular, the Dominicans—to use the Inquisition to resolve the issue of Maimonides' orthodoxy. Eventually, Abraham and his party won; the mendicants burned Maimonides' writings at their request. Jewish historians say this shows the Inquisition was "perhaps actively looking for an excuse to strike out at the Jews."[158] But the Dominicans were caught between two groups of Jews who could not resolve their own dispute but who thought the Church could. Hence, both sides appealed to the Inquisition for a judgment. Abraham of Montpellier, according to one Jewish historian, was "imitating the example of Pope Gregory IX," when he "issued a ban against the Maimonist writings at the beginning of 1232." The orthodox Jews wanted "the Dominican Friars to proceed against Jewish heretics in the same fashion as against Christian dissenters." The avidity with which this group of Jews sought out the Dominicans belies the claim that "Christian orthodoxy now appeared willing and eager to try and equate Jews with heretics." The Jews sought the Church's aid in ridding the synagogue of heretics, not the other way around. The incident was the opening act in the great drama of the Church's discovery of and crusade against the Talmud. "Forty days did not pass from the burning of our teacher's [Maimonides] works until that of the Talmud," one chronicler wrote. His account though "can hardly be considered factual. Nonetheless, the thrust of his argument reveals the perspective of contemporary Jews." It also shows "in a certain measure Jews were responsible for the inauguration of the crusade against their writings."[159]

That crusade began in 1236 when Nicholas Donin, an apostate Jew who had become a Christian and a Dominican (some sources claim he was a

Franciscan), was granted an audience with Pope Gregory IX. Donin called the pope's attention to the blasphemies in the collection of Hebrew writings known as the Talmud. Donin's outspoken opinions had caused his expulsion from the synagogue 11 years earlier, so revenge may have been a motive, but Donin took with him an acute understanding of the role the Talmud played in Jewish life. It was, as Graetz claimed, "the mainstay of Jewish civilization" but it was also full of blasphemies—claiming, among other things, that Christ was being cooked in boiling excrement in hell and that he was the illegitimate son of a Roman soldier and a whore named Mary.

The *Jewish Encyclopedia*, for example, discussing Celsus' debt to Judaism, remarks that "he asserts that Jesus was the illegitimate son of a certain Panthera, and again that he had been a servant in Egypt, not when a child, as according to the New Testament, but when he was grown, and that there he learned the secret art. These statements are frequently identical with those of the Talmud." According to another source, the Jews "call Christ the illegitimate son of a whore, and the Blessed Virgin Mary, an abominable thing to say or even to think, a woman of heat or lust, and they curse both, and the Roman faith, and all its members and believers."[160a]

Before Donin, the Talmud was virtually unknown among Christians who, like Pope Gregory IX, labored under the illusion that the Jews merely followed the Torah, books which Catholics also considered canonical. As a result of these discoveries, "the Talmud suddenly became a prime target of Christian anti-Judaism."[161] The campaign against the Talmud is the beginning of the change in the Church's attitude toward the Jews. Cohen's proposed dichotomy in Christian teaching on the Jews doesn't exist. *Sicut Judaeis non* never changed from the time of St. Gregory the Great to the time of the mendicants. What changed was the Church's understanding of the Jews. They were in the eyes of the Church transformed from essentially blind followers of a perversely understood Torah to social revolutionaries largely as a result of the discovery of the Talmud and its blasphemies.

Cohen adverts to this when the writes "the Talmud and writings of medieval rabbis remained generally unknown to Christians for centuries after Augustine."[162] As a result, he repeatedly contradicts his own thesis, especially when he notes "when Jews had recourse to him for protection, Gregory showed himself benign, issuing in his turn the basic papal Constitution on the Jews, *Sicut Judaeis non*."[163] In other words, Gregory never deviated from *Sicut Judaeis non*. Cohen claims the popes were "bound to protect only those [Jews] who conformed to the classical Augustinian conception of the bearers of the Old Testament."[164] This is not true, but when he adds "that sort of Jew no longer existed,"[165] he is getting to the heart of the matter. This is another way of saying that the Church's understanding of the Jew changed. No pope ever said anyone had a right to harm the Jew or force his conversion. The popes never said papal protection extended to behavior that was "*extra legem*."

How could they? That would mean Jews could engage in criminal activity with impunity. But the discovery of the Talmud indicated that that sort of behavior lay at the heart of the Jewish "religion." That caused Gregory's shocked response to Nicholas Donin.

When Gregory IX heard that the bands of crusaders were massacring Jews, he reiterated the prohibition against harming them. Gregory IX, according to Cohen, "passionately disliked Jews," but "like all medieval popes, Gregory drew the line at physical persecution."[566] Gregory also "sternly reminded Christian folk that baptism must never be imposed upon anybody,"[567] but he still got blamed for the excesses of those who ignored him. The same is true of his condemnation of the Talmud, which is said to have led directly to the disappearance of Jews from Western Europe, making conversion sound like another word for Auschwitz:

> Condemning the Talmud in 1239 as a heretical deviation from the Jews' biblical heritage, Pope Gregory IX probably did not conceive of the important effects his pronouncements would have on the course of history. He could not have foreseen that he had sanctioned the commencement of an ideological trend that would justify attempts to eliminate the Jewish presence in Christendom, a radical shift from the Augustinian position that the Jews occupied a rightful and necessary place in Christian society. Yet Gregory's awakening to the discrepancy between the religion of contemporary Jews and that of the "biblical" Jews whom Augustine had wished to tolerate coupled with the pontiff's exclamation that the belief in the Talmud "is said to be the chief cause that holds the Jews obstinate in their perfidy," laid important groundwork for those who came after him. In the generations that followed the Paris disputation of 1240 and the initial burning of the Talmud in 1242, mendicant inquisitors throughout Europe continued to persecute rabbinic literature, compelled the Jews to submit to their inflammatory sermons, and where possible often worked toward the complete destruction of specific Jewish communities. Early in the 14th century, Bernard Gui burned the Talmud even in the absence of Jews.[568]

Even Innocent III, unaware of the Talmud's existence, had dealt with the contingency it presented when he excluded from protection under *Sicut Judaeis non* Jews who plotted against the faith. "We wish," Innocent wrote, "to place under the protection of this decree only those who have not presumed to plot against the Christian faith."[569] Cohen concludes "such a stipulation might have excluded a large portion, if not all, of European Jewry."[570] Why? Was it because the pope had changed his mind? Or because, as the Talmud revealed, the Jews were not practitioners of just another false religion but of one that had revolutionary intent? "By the fourteenth century," Cohen continues, "the *Sicut Judaeis* bull in particular and papal protection of the Jews in general had all but lost their practical effectiveness."[571] But, as Cohen points out, the

popes never stopped ordering Christians not to harm the Jews. Why [illegible] Jews lost their protection? The only logical answer is: they were [illegible] as operating "*extra legem*" as revolutionaries and outlaws and, therefore, longer worthy of protection.

I am addressing only official protection. The mob, as we have [illegible] shown, ignored papal bulls when it sacked Jewish sections of medieval [illegible] It was only the higher clergy in general and the popes in particular whom Jews could count on for protection, and the segregating legislation they [illegible] was intended to protect the Jews as much to protect Christendom from Jew[illegible] subversion, a goal consistent with *Sicut Judaeis non*. In attempting to establish some dichotomy in Catholic teaching (as opposed to a dichotomy in Catholic perception, which did take place), Cohen makes absurd generalizations. Only "from the 13th century onward," Cohen tells us, "were Jews portrayed as [illegible] active agents of Satan."[173] Cohen evidently never read the Gospel of John. In chapter 8, Christ himself portrayed the Jews as "active agents of Satan." The same applies to the Revelation of John, which refers to Jews as "the synagogue of Satan."

The Church had always claimed the Jews were not children of Moses and Abraham but rather children of Satan. Nevertheless, the Church in *Sicut Judaeis non* consistently maintained that no one had the right to harm a Jew. If the Jew were engaged in criminal activity, as the state then construed it, the state could proceed against him, but that did not negate *Sicut Judaeis non*. What changed as a result of the discovery of the Talmud was the number of Jews that were perceived as engaged in subversive behavior. Accusations of blood libel, host desecration, the poisoning of wells, and holding the Jews responsible for the Black Plague, all emanated from the popular mind not the mind of the Church. The popes, as in the case of the plague, often went out of their way to refute them, insisting always that no one had the right to harm a Jew.

Cohen consistently misrepresents this point. He accuses the Church of "nativism," because "the romana ecclesia was also a society which strove to achieve functional unity and root out foreign influences."[174] What does he mean by foreign? Europe was a group of ethnic groups speaking different languages, all of which were foreign to each other. According to Cohen, the Church "attacked a religious group which detracted from that unity, charging it with the same basic crimes: heretical deviation from Scripture, blaspheming the ideals of the society, and immoral and unnatural hostility toward its citizens."[175] But, if the Jews did what the Talmud said they did, they were not just another religion, most certainly not the religion of Moses and Abraham. They were a group of outlaws. Why should they not be treated as outlaws? Wasn't that the role of the state? Cohen as much as admits this, then tries to deflect its implications by exaggeration. "The Jews of medieval Europe espoused a new system of belief," he tells us, which is true. But "the

had lost the right to exist in Christendom previously accorded them because of their adherence to ancient, biblical Judaism."[75] If Cohen means innocent Jews could now be harmed with impunity, he is wrong. If he means the State could now proceed against them because they were operating "*extra legem*," then he is right, but it proceeded against them as criminals not as Jews. The Inquisition never proceeded against Jews on either racial or religious grounds. Gregory IX was the first pope to discover the Talmud. He was shocked by what he discovered, but he did not abrogate *Sacut Judaeis non* and its prohibition against harming the Jew. What changed was his understanding of what the Jews believed and how they acted on those beliefs.

On June 9, 1239, Pope Gregory responded to Donin's 35 petitions in dispatching him with a letter to William of Auvergne, bishop of Paris. His letter substantiates the changed perception of Jews. The Jews, Gregory wrote, "so we have heard, are not content with the Old Law which God gave to Moses in writing; they even ignore it completely and affirm that God gave another Law which is called 'Talmud,' that is 'Teaching,' handed down to Moses orally. . . . In this is contained matter so abusive and so unspeakable that it arouses shame in those who mention it and horror in those who hear it."[76] The offenses are so great that Gregory uses the word "crime" to describe them. He also claims the Talmud is "the chief cause that holds the Jews obstinate in their perfidy."[77] He ordered "on the first Saturday of Lent to come, in the morning which the Jews are gathered in the synagogues, you shall, by our order seize all the books of the Jews who live in your districts and have these books carefully guarded in the possession of the Dominican and Franciscan friars."[78] If those friars found the books offensive, they were to burn them.

The discovery of the Talmud changed the status of the Jews. In addition to "displaying no shame for their guilt nor reverence for the honor of the Christian faith," the Talmud's blasphemies indicated the Jews had equal contempt for "the Law of Moses and the prophets" which the Christians thought they honored.[79] Instead of following God's word in the Torah, the Jews "follow some tradition of their elders," giving it priority over the word of God.[80] The Talmud asserts rabbis are superior to the biblical prophets and that the Jews must obey them even to the absurd point of abrogating Mosaic Law. As a result the Jews prevent their children from studying the Bible, by placing the Talmud at the center of their educational curriculum.

It took a while for the Church to digest what it had learned about the Talmud, but Pope Gregory's letter to the bishop of Paris indicated "the attack on the Talmud heralded a change in the Church's basic attitude toward Judaism."[81] Three years later, Bishop Eudes's legantine commission reported that the Talmud was "full of innumerable errors, abuses, blasphemies and wickedness such as arouse shame in those that speak of them and horrify the hearer."[82] The books were so horrifying that they "cannot be tolerated in the name of God without injury to the Christian Faith."[83] In a letter to St.

Louis IX, King of France, in May 1244, Innocent IV, Gregory's su... drew certain conclusions. "The wicked perfidy of the Jews," he said, ... not properly heed the fact that Christian piety received them and pr... allows them to live in Christendom through pity only. Instead, it co... such grave sins that are stupefying to those who hear of them and horri... those who tell of them."[184] The Talmud's blasphemies and its injunctions a... defrauding the unsuspecting *goyim* threatened the conditions under w... Jews were tolerated. They called for rethinking the whole social compact.

Upset by the harm that it was doing, St. Louis called a conferen... the Talmud. In June 1240, Nicholas Donin had an extended debate ... Rabbi Yehiel ben Joseph of Paris under royal auspices and presided ov... the queen mother, Blanche of Castile. One Jewish commentator claims ... entire event epitomized the declining status of Jews in that century and t... transformation in Christian minds into little more than embodiments ... blasphemous doctrine."[185] The rabbi was dumbfounded that he had to defe... Jewish esoteric writings in a hostile environment. Nothing like this h... ever happened before. Rabbi Yehiel, lacking any precedent for conducting ... disputation of this sort, didn't know how to respond. When asked whether ... were true that the Talmud claimed "Jesus was condemned to an eternity ... hell, immersed in 'boiling excrement'" and Mary, his mother, was a whore, t... Rabbi could only respond, yes, those passages were in the Talmud, but th... did not refer to "that" Jesus or "that" Mary. "Not every Louis born in Fran... is the king of France," Yehiel maintained, giving new meaning to the term ... "chutzpah." "Has it not happened," he continued, "that two men were bor... in the same city, had the same name, and died in the same manner? There ar... many such cases."[186] One Jewish historian referred to Rabbi Yehiel's denial ... the birth of Jewish humor. A Christian account of the debate, however, fails ... to see the humor. "Concerning this Jesus, he confessed that he was born ou... of adultery and that he is punished in hell in boiling excrement and that h... lived at the time of Titus." But Rabbi Yehiel said, "this Jesus is different from ... our Jesus. However, he is unable to say who he was, whence it is clear that he ... lied."[187]

Having exploded his own credibility, Yehiel could do little to refute Donin's ... claim that the Talmud sanctioned criminal behavior, including "murder, ... theft, and religious intolerance." The Talmud also "included strictures against ... trusting Gentiles, honoring them or even returning a lost piece of property ... to them."[188] The Rabbis would have done better to emulate Maimonides, but ... "drugged . . . into comfort with the narcotic of the Cabala, an otherworldly ... withdrawal into astrology and demonology, considered fit only for those who ... had mastered traditional Talmudic learning" they were no match for those ... trained by the Dominicans.[189] Many Jews took "the terrible deterioration of ... the status and security of the Jews" as "a sign of the coming of the Messiah," ... something one historian calls, "a characteristic figment of the Jewish mind."

. In the Jewish context, it is the syndrome of waiting quietly for the holocaust. Thus the Orthodox rabbinate failed to exercise leadership on behalf of the Jews in the 13th century Ashkenaz as was again the case in 20th century Poland."[190]

With defenders like Rabbi Yehiel, the Talmud needed no enemies. The debate resulted in the public burning of the Talmud in Paris. The Jewish religion was now clearly seen not as biblical Judaism, but rather as a heretical deviation from the Old Testament. Over a 36-hour period in June 1242, over 10,000 volumes were consigned to the flames. As if determined to prove what the Christians had said was correct, a group of Jews appealed to Rome, "complaining that they could not practice their religion without the Talmud."[191] "Once more," one Jewish commentator writes, "it was the pope to whom the Jews had turned in their extremity."[192] In May 1244, Innocent IV, relented: "bound as we are by the Divine command to tolerate them in their Law, [we] thought fit to have the answer given them that we do not want to deprive them of their books if as a result we should be depriving them of their law."[193] The decision to return the Talmud to the Jews caused outrage. One bishop concluded the Jews had lied to the pope, and it would be "most disgraceful and a cause of shame for the Apostolic Throne, if books that had been so solemnly and so justly burned in the presence of all the scholars and of the clergy, and of the populace of Paris were to be given back to the masters of the Jews at the order of the pope—for such tolerance would seem to mean approval."[194] In 1254 Louis IX renewed the ordinance ordering the burning of the Talmud, as did both of his successors. When Louis X readmitted the Jews into France, he barred them from bringing the Talmud with them.

After the disputations, the Church made conversion of the Jews a high priority. In 1242, James I, King of Aragon, compelled Jews by force of law to listen to sermons of the mendicants, "a measure which drew considerable praise from Innocent IV and which James renewed in 1263."[195] In 1278, Pope Nicholas III "formally made preaching and missionizing among the Jews part of the apostolate of both the Dominican and Franciscan orders."[196] In his bull *Vineam Soreth*, Nicholas urged the mendicants to "overcome the obstinacy of the perverse Jews. . . . Summon them to sermons in the places where they live. . . . Inform them of evangelical doctrines with salutary warnings and discreet reasoning."[197]

Once Judaism ceased being the religion of the Old Testament in the mind of the Church, it was construed instead as a heresy that fell under the Church's jurisdiction as doctrinal watchdog. The Talmud was an offense not only against the Christians but against the religious life of Jews as well, which allowed the pope to intervene into their affairs "if they violate the law of the Gospel in moral matters and their own prelates do not check them" or "if they invent heresies against their own law."[198] "Innocent's line of thought quickly became the common opinion of 13th and 14th century canonists."[199] The Church, according to the Dominican inquisitor Nicholas Eymeric, now

had the right and duty "to defend genuine Judaism against internal he
and thereby to bring Jews closer to an acceptance of Christianity."[200]

St. Raymond of Penafort, General of the Dominicans, the man who
Gregory IX to listen to Nicholas Donin in 1236, organized another disputa
in Barcelona over four sessions from July 20 to July 27, 1263, between an
converted rabbi, Saul of Montpellier, now known as Pablo Christiani (or
Chretien) and Rabbi Moses ben Nachman of Gerona. Christiani wa
low-level convert. He had studied under the direction of Rabbis Eliezer
Emmanuel of Tarascon and Jacob ben Elligah Alttes of Venice. Christ
must have been influenced by the Order of Preachers while still a
because he joined the Dominicans almost immediately after converting, a
consistent with the apostolate of the Dominicans, devoted the rest of his
to conversion of the Jews. As a result of the debate and Raymond's effo
the focus of the Inquisition shifted from southern France to the Iberi
peninsula, where it inaugurated "a second stage in the development of th
new anti-Jewish polemic."[201]

Raymond of Penafort entered the Order of Preachers in 1222, a
eight years later, Gregory IX summoned him to Rome to be his confes
Raymond remained at that post until 1238, when he became Master Gener
of the Dominicans. If there is one man responsible for the Jews' disappearan
from Western Europe by 1500, it is Raymond of Penafort. His tool was n
expulsion nor force but reason and persuasion, the most powerful weapo
in the arsenal of cultural warfare but the most difficult to wield. Raymon
persuaded Thomas Aquinas to write his conversion tract, the *Summa Contra
Gentiles*, in which Aquinas insisted conversion must be based on "recour
to the natural reason, to which all men are forced to give their assent."[202] Th
infidel, according to Penafort, had to be converted "soothingly," by an appe
to reason and not to force.[203] Penafort persuaded James I of Aragon to bri
the Inquisition to Aragon. He was "the moving spirit. . . of Gregory IX in al
that affected the Jews," including Gregory's sympathetic reception of Nichol
Donin.[204] In 1250 St. Raymond took the initial steps to establish a Dominica
academy for the study of Arabic in Tunis, reasoning that conversion of th
Moslems was impossible unless the Dominicans learned the language an
sacred scriptures of those they hoped to convert. So, too, "certain friars we
thus instructed in the Hebrew language, so that they could overcome th
malice and the errors of the Jews."[205]

The strategy of having Dominicans study the Talmud was not witho
danger, which became more apparent during the Reformation. In 1275 th
English Dominican Robert of Reading converted to Judaism after learnin
Hebrew, exposing in microcosmic form the perennial English attractio
to things Jewish. Three hundred years later, England's enthusiasm for th
Hebrew language was on the verge of leading that country into an orgy
judaizing and revolutionary politics that culminated in the mid-17th centur

when Puritans murdered the king. Pope Honorius IV (1285-1287) warned the faithful "the Jews of England lived with, and corrupted Christians":

> Among the techniques [the Jews] used was that of inviting Christian to their synagogues where the Torah would be venerated by all present, including the Christian guests; another was to keep their Christian servants busy with servile labor on days of precept, *thus preparing the way for failures against the faith on the part of Christian women by first inducing them to moral failure*; in general, English Jews used social contacts to prepare apostasy. Finally, the Jews daily cursed Christians in their "supplications, or more precisely, imprecations." The English hierarchs, so the Pope berated them, had often been instructed to remedy the situation but their negligence required the present letter.[206]

Penafort's most famous pupils were Pablo Christiani, with whom he worked out, in the words of Jeremy Cohen, "tactics [that] often resulted in a considerable number of conversions"[207] and Raymond Martini, author of *Pugio Fidei*, Dagger of the Faith, which was, in Cohen's words, "the most learned and best documented polemic against Judaism which the Middle Ages produced."[208] Jews in the early days of Christianity like Rabbi Akiba, according to Martini's view,

> died at the hands of the Romans not because they kept the law of Moses but because they forsook it, by supporting two false messiahs in succession, inciting rebellion against Rome, and denying that Jesus was the Messiah. By rejecting God as their savior, the Jews of the Talmud destroyed the whole system of divine prophecy in the Old Testament.[209]

The Jews were heretics to their own religion, and since the Torah was part of the canon of Christian scripture, they were heretics in the Christian sense, too. Since heresy was not a matter of indifference to the civil authorities, the Talmudic Jews lost the tolerance that the blind and carnal figures from the Old Testament enjoyed and became *personae extra legem*, i.e., outlaws.

Raymond Llull made the same point. Llull underwent conversion from a dissolute life at the court in Aragon. Like Martini and others of his generation, Llull considered the Jews not as preservers of the Old Testament but "outlaws." Forsaking the Torah, they now lived "*extra legem*." Like Martini, Llull dedicated his life to their conversion. Llull, says Cohen, "devised grandiose schemes for converting the Jewish community to Christianity, systematically and completely. As for those Jews who would ultimately persist in refusing baptism, he advocated their permanent expulsion from Christian society."[210] Cohen portrays the alternatives invidiously, but they flowed from the medieval notion of citizenship as privilege rather than right, something that pertained to localities often on the scale of city-states rather than nations in the modern sense. If citizenship in a state like Florence entailed fulfillment of certain duties, then aliens like the Jew lived there only by sufferance of Christian

kings and not by any right. If resident aliens were dedicated to ru
of those states, evidence of which the newly discovered Talmud pr
then the Jew's status in those states was precarious at best. Cohen
state it this way, but the wave of conversions and expulsions which
virtually every state in Western Europe from the 13th to the 15th cen
based on the discovery of the Talmud, what it revealed about the true
of the Jews, and the conclusions statesmen drew from that evidence
discovery of the Talmud changed the Jewish question fundamentally
used to be a question of religious tolerance became an issue of civil or
Christian king could tolerate outsiders who based their religion on a
but sincere understanding of the Old Testament; he could not tolerate
and subversives using religion as a cover for social revolution. Hence
admonition to those who wielded the sword of civil authority: "You, the
owe it to these children of God that you protect them from criminals and
robbers and from arsonists, from Jews, from heathens, and from heretics
perjurers and from illegal violence."[211] The Jews were categorized with cri
as people who promoted "illegal violence." They were, says Cohen, "no
the Jews of the Bible, to whom the right of existence in Christendom
been guaranteed."[212] Even here, Cohen misstates the position of the C
The Jews never had any rights in medieval Christendom. They were tole
as aliens because they were economically useful and for theological rea
When it became obvious that their usefulness was vitiated by their
recognized penchant for subversion, they were offered the alternat
changing their behavior, via baptism, or being expelled. But even exp
was not a violation of their rights because, as aliens, Jews had no rights.

Once the contents of the Talmud became known, interfaith dialog
never strong in the Middle Ages—was absorbed into the hermet
of suspicion. According to Llull, the only reason "a Jew wants to
conversation with you" is "so that you might thereby become weaker
weaker in your belief." Simple folk should be on their guard, because the
"has thought out well for a long time how he will converse with you, in
that you might thereby become ever weaker in your faith. For the same
it is decreed by Scripture and the papacy that no unlearned man should
with a Jew."[213] Once the pernicious nature of the Talmud became known
Church had to face the issue of Jewish subversion. It was time to admin
the medicine of conversion to the Jews.

In 1267, Clement IV issued the bull *Turbato Corde*. With his hear
turmoil (hence the title) Clement implies proselytizing was a two-way
in medieval Europe by complaining, "exceedingly numerous repo
Christians, denying the truth of the Catholic faith, have gone over, in
worthy of damnation, to the rite of the Jews."[214] Clement's response was to
the *relapsi* as heretics, i.e., subjecting them to the Inquisition, and to pu

Jews who helped them relapse. He appealed primarily to the mendicants, who ran the machinery of the Inquisition. They were told

> to proceed against Christians whom you shall have discovered to have committed such things in the same way as against heretics; Jews, however, whom you shall have discovered inducing Christians of either sex into their execrable rite, before this, or in the future, these you are to punish with due penalty.[215]

Clement's decree was consistent with the understanding of the Talmudic Jew as subversive. Since Jews were heretics to their own religion and induced unsuspecting Christians to embrace their heresy, they would be drawn closer to the Inquisition, the machinery constructed to combat heresy. The issue of conversion played a role too. If the Jew accepted baptism, it was presumed that he accepted it freely, and he was not permitted to relapse into his former life, like a dog returning to his vomit. If he relapsed, he was to be treated as a heretic, not an infidel tolerated because of ignorance. Because the theology of the sacrament of baptism claimed that that sacrament left an indelible mark on the soul, "it is necessary that they be forced to uphold the faith which they accepted under duress or by necessity, lest the name of the Lord be brought into disrepute, and the faith which they accepted be held vile and contemptible."[216]

Cohen faults Innocent III for acting "even though he himself had issued the traditional repetition of *Sicut Judaeis* only two years earlier."[217] But there is no contradiction. Jews who consented "in the slightest degree" to baptism were no longer Jews; *Sicut Judaeis non* no longer applied to them. Jews who relapsed were heretics to be investigated by the Inquisition. If they persisted in apostasy, they could be turned over to the secular powers and burned at the stake. Jews who engaged in subversion were criminals, to be treated as such. The problem persisted: Clement's successor, Gregory X, complained in 1274 that the Jews continued to proselytize and "even some Christians by birth" had "wickedly transferred themselves to the rites of Judaism."[218]

The Talmudic Jew was seen increasingly as deliberately attacking Christians, urged on by the Talmud itself. As a result, they were perceived as a group "who endanger public safety." Martini identified contemporary Judaism as "a new religion which we were not commanded at Sinai":

> The attack of the mendicant Inquisition on contemporary Jewry relied on the claim that ***rabbinic Judaism, embodied in the Talmud, which had just become known to the Church, was heretical and evil.*** In their belief that all heresy threatened the proper order of a universal Christian society, and especially incensed by evidence of hostility toward Gentiles in the Talmud which they assumed applied to Christians, the friars began to see no place for the Jews in Christendom.[219]

Once the Church discovered the Talmud and understood the threat the [illegible] posed to the social order, she had to do something, if for no other [illegible] than to head off the mob violence that knowledge of the Talmud was [illegible] to generate among Christians. The natural reaction to the threat of Jew[illegible] subversion is violence, a reaction that can be seen in the Chmielnicki pogr[illegible] in 1648 and when Bolshevism threatened the social order of Europe dur[illegible] the 1920s and 30s.

The supernatural reaction to the threat of Jewish subversion was based [illegible] charity, which is to say, bringing those in darkness to the light of truth, wh[illegible] is another way of describing conversion. The point of Martini's *Pugio Fid*[illegible] was the conversion of the Moors and the Jews, especially the latter, becau[illegible] they "constitute the worst enemy of the Church, and . . . converting the[illegible] outweighs even that of the Christian mission to the Muslims." As we ha[illegible] seen, Judaism, according to the new Catholic insight, was not a religion; [illegible] was a revolutionary ideology. In espousing the Talmud, the Jews deprive[illegible] themselves of any correct understanding of the Bible; their allegiance, according to Martini, lies with the Antichrist. As a result, "the redeemer whom they now expect at the end of the Roman Empire is really the Antichrist."[illegible]

The Church could have turned the Jews over to the secular arm fo[illegible] prosecution as outlaws, but instead it concluded that the most charitable thing was to convert them. Martini explains at length why the Jews have not converted:

> First, the Jews have always been greedy people, and they fear that by abandoning the promise of temporal reward in their law they would invite financial penury upon themselves. Second, "from the cradle they have been nurtured in the hatred of Christ, and they curse Christianity and the Christians daily in their synagogues." The supposition upon which one is reared eventually becomes part of one's natural outlook, in this case perverting any rational, objective sense of judgment. Third, Christianity demands subscription to difficult beliefs.[121]

The Church could do nothing about the first and third conditions. Poverty and belief beyond the ken of reason were part of the Gospel the Church had to preach. But she could do something about Jews cursing Christians and Christianity in their synagogues by first exposing and then publicly burning the Talmud. She did that as her first step in converting the Jews, because the Talmud was the biggest hindrance to conversion. The Church's campaign against the Talmud led to "a crescendo of conversions," which by 1260 "already necessitated special orders to facilitate the new Christians' integration into local society."[122] The campaign was supplemented by the secular arm, which was determined to segregate the Jews to limit their pernicious influence. Louis IX implemented the anti-Jewish edicts of the Fourth Lateran Council by ordering all Jews within his realm to wear "a circle of felt or yellow cloth

stitched upon the outer garment in front and in back" about "the size of a palm," so the simple folk might not fall unsuspecting into intercourse with Jews of the sort Raymond Llull would warn against.[113] The combined power of Church and State was brought to bear on the Talmudic Jews, who considered the loving ministrations of the mendicants "an unmitigated disaster" and "unquestionably the nadir of Jewish fortunes" precisely because so many Jews were persuaded by their reasoning and voluntarily embraced Christianity.

After the discovery of the Talmud, the Jews became "the ultimate outsiders." The Jews, in Cohen's words, "had come to represent *a reversal or denial of the social order as it was intended* to be."[114] They became revolutionaries, outlaws, and subversives, and by the end of the 13th century, they were universally recognized as such. The expulsions that followed were the official recognition of a status that had its roots in the discovery of the Talmud.

As Cantor notes, "a remarkable number of Jewish converts"[115] became Dominicans because Dominican efforts struck at the heart of Judaism when they exposed the Talmud. Once the Talmud was exposed, it lost its validity. Giving his own take on the "crescendo of conversions," Cantor writes, "a small but significant minority of the rabbinate went over to the Christian side" because "a cultural civil war was being fought among the Jews in 13th century France and later also in Iberia. We will probably never know what happened in detail, but it happened, that is for sure."[116]

Throughout this period, the Church never changed its position that no one had the right to harm the Jew. Nicholas IV at the end of the 13th century expressly forbade the molesting of Jewish residents in Rome. When the Jews were assaulted by violent mobs, the popes were their first defenders. Clement VI reminded the faithful "Let no Christian compel Jews to come to baptism by violence, these same unwilling or refusing. . . . Too, let no Christian have the presumption to wound or to kill those same Jewish persons, nor to take their money from them, *apart from the lawful sentence of the lord of the region*" who had authority to deal with criminals.[117]

The papal tradition of protecting the Jews manifested itself during the Black Death, when Jews were accused of spreading the plague and suffered accordingly. In October 1347, a fleet of Genoese ships brought the plague to Italy from the Crimea. By 1350, 25 million people had died. Many survivors blamed the Jews. Bands of flagellants roamed the countryside trying to stem the plague with penances. When a group of them arrived in Frankfurt in July 1349, "they rushed directly to the Jewish quarter and led the local population in wholesale slaughter." In September 1348, Pope Clement VI exonerated the Jews from responsibility for the plague. "If the Jews were guilty," he reasoned, "We would wish them struck by a penalty of suitable severity." But "since this pestilence, all but universal everywhere, by a mysterious judgment of God has afflicted and does now afflict through the diverse regions of the earth, both Jews and many other nations to whom life in common with Jews is unknown,

that the Jews have provided the occasion or the cause for such a crime h... plausibility."[228] Clement concluded his bull "by commanding all ordinari... announce to their people, as they gathered to celebrate the liturgy, that... Jews were not to be struck, not to be wounded, not to be killed, and that... those who did these things put themselves under the ban of the Church." As a result, the papal states became a perennial place of refuge for Europ... Jews, often to the chagrin of princes who felt those states were harbor... subversives, whereas "outside papal territory, the Jews continued to su... persecution for witchcraft and poisoning."[230]

The "crescendo of conversions" did not diminish during the Black Plag... even though the number of people inhabiting Europe did. In 1390, St. Vince... Ferrer baptized the famous rabbi Solomon ha-Levi, and a massive wave... conversions followed in Spain. In 1388 "an exceptionally large number of Je... came into Italy, announcing that they wished to enter the Church."[231] Trying to make sense of the wave of conversions that swept Spain in 1390, Cantor describes medieval Judaism succumbing to its own internal contradictions. Its great weakness was "its finite, static quality."[232] The Jews had rejected reason when they rejected Maimonides; as a result Judaism's "only innovative wing was in hazardous theosophic irrationalism,"[233] which "could not offer a durable response to persecution and discomfort or a comprehensive social theory."[234] But those "sephardic Jewish intellectuals who, after 1390, for whatever initial motive, proceeded to cross over into Christianity, found in Latin Christian culture a much more complex and vibrant culture that they eagerly embraced."[235] The sephardic elite who abandoned Maimonides and succumbed to the mumbo-jumbo of the Cabala descended into the Gnostic dualism the Church had defeated when it defeated the Albigensians. The descent into astrology, magic, and demonology would culminate when Cabala brought forth the false messiah Shabbetai Zevi, 300 years later.

In the meantime, Jews converted *en masse*. "By the second quarter of the 15th century," Cantor says

> more than half the Jewish elite and an unknown proportion of the Jewish masses—at least one hundred thousand people—had converted to Christianity. These included great merchants, government officials and rabbinical scholars. Some of the scholars advanced to prominent roles in the clergy. A prominent 15th century bishop of Burgos in Castile was a former rabbi, and his son became a bishop.[236]

A wave of expulsions followed the wave of conversions. The Jews were expelled from Cologne in 1424, from Speyer in 1435, and from Mainz in 1438. In 1492, in an act that would have momentous consequences for the revolutionary movement, the Jews were expelled from Spain. "These events," Glick says, referring to the conversions and expulsions, "dealt a blow to Ashkenazic Jewry from which . . . it never recovered."[237] By 1450 the medieval phase of Jewish

history in Germany and France had ended. The Ashkenazim migrated to Poland, which would become the *paradisus Judeorum* until their excesses as tax farmers helped cause the Chmielnicki pogroms. The Sephardim migrated to the Spanish Netherlands, where they would link up with English Protestants and German Anabaptists to create the Iconoclast rebellion of 1566.

Forced conversion created a bitterness that would bring about the first major outburst of revolutionary activity since the failed uprisings of antiquity in Jerusalem. Excess is part of the tragedy of history, but it should not obscure the sincere conversions that were its antithesis. Nor should it obscure the truth that the Church of the Middle Ages, no matter what her excesses, recognized her fundamental purpose is evangelization, and that conversion is its necessary corollary. If the Church had not embarked on its campaign to convert the Jews, she would have conceded the field to those who felt the only way to deal with Jewish subversion was elimination, the choice the neopagan movement National Socialism pursued in the 20th century.

The prelates of the Middle Ages may have been overzealous; that is for God to judge. At least in their zeal they were Christian, which is more than can be said for their 21st century successors. On November 6, 2002, Walter Cardinal Kasper, president of the Vatican Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews, announced at Boston College, that Jews "in order to be saved" do not "have to become Christians; if they follow their own conscience and believe in God's promises as they understand them in their religious tradition they are in line with God's plan, which *for us* comes to its historical completion in Jesus Christ."[238] Does "us" refer to Innocent III? Pablo Christiani? St. John Chrysostom? St. Paul? St. Peter? The term "us" is not broad enough to include both Walter Kasper and them.

Chapter Five

False Conversion and the Inquisition

In 1350, three years after the arrival of the Black Death in Genoa, Pedro the Cruel ascended to the throne of Castile. His coronation must have caused great rejoicing among Jews because within months he turned the administration of his kingdom over to them. The rejoicing, however, was short lived. Pope Urban V, reacting to hostile reports from the clergy in Castile, denounced Pedro as "a rebel to the Church, an enabler of Jews and Moors, a propagator of infidelity and a slayer of Christians."[1] Pedro's tolerance for the Jews quickly became a liability, exploited by his illegitimate brother, Henry of Trastamara, who articulated the old grievances against the Jews in a campaign to gain the throne for himself. The Jews had been blamed for the plague, a charge refuted by Pope Clement VI, but resentment did not subside when the plague did or when the pope refuted erroneous popular arguments.

The Jews were viewed as a subversive and exploitative fifth column in 14th century Spain. Indeed, they had always been viewed that way there. The history of Jewish subversion in Spain could not be erased. There was too much evidence. The Jews had conspired with the Moors to overthrow the Visigoths. When their conspiracy became apparent, persecution followed. In 694, the 17th Council of Toledo proclaimed "the impious Jews dwelling within the frontiers of our Kingdom . . . have entered into a plot with those other Hebrews in regions beyond the seas, in order that they might act as one against the Christian race . . . through their crimes, they would not only throw the Church into confusion, but, indeed, by their attempted tyranny, have essayed to bring ruin to the Fatherland and to all the population."[2] In 852, the *Anales Bertinianos* described the loss of Barcelona because the Jews "played the traitor," allowing the Moors to capture it. As a result, "nearly all the Christians" were "killed; the city [was] devastated," and the Jews "retire[d] unpunished."[3] The Jews "defined themselves as the antithesis of Christianity" and conspired with Christendom's enemies.[4] Although they prospered under the Visigoths in Spain, they nevertheless conspired with Arabs in Africa to overthrow the Visigothic monarchy. At the beginning of the 8th century, they used their contacts with African Jews to prepare the

invasion of the Mohammedan Berbers across the straits of Gibraltar. When the Mohammedans conquered Spain, the Jews flourished, achieving one of the most sophisticated cultures in Europe. The Jews excelled in medicine and helped bring Aristotle to Europe. But the flower of Sephardic culture drew economic substance from unsavory roots. The Sephardic Jews grew rich on slaves and usury.

When the Spaniards began the *reconquista*, the Jews were not persecuted, despite further acts of bad faith:

> Saint Fernando, on taking Cordoba from the Saracens, turned over four mosques to the large Jewish population, to convert into synagogues, and gave them one of the most delightful parts of the city for their homes, on two conditions: that they refrain from reviling the Christian religion, and from proselytizing among Christians. The Jews made both promises, and kept neither.[5]

Even as Islam was rolled back to North Africa, the Jews continued to collaborate with the Muslims. Spanish Christians were persuaded that the Muslim invader had been welcomed by the Jews and assisted by them, with all this implied for the national and religious life of Spain. The Judaeo-Muslim symbiosis that characterizes most of the Arab occupation gives considerable plausibility to the Christian view that in these two communities, alien born in faith and at law, Christendom faced an unfriendly alliance.

Much of the civil order in Spain was enforced through canon law, but Jews, because they were not Christians, could not be touched by that law. "The laws against blasphemy, for example, could not be enforced against them. They could encourage heresy, and, in defense could claim the freedom of worship granted to the Jews."[6] Jews were therefore allowed to engage in many subversive activities with impunity, which caused resentment.

Because Jews were above or beyond the law, Christians were often tempted to apostatize to obtain "freedom." Heretics like the Cathars of Leon, according to Lucas of Tuy, writing about 1230, would circumcise themselves so that "under the guise of Jews," they could "propound heretical dogmas and dispute with Christians; what they dared not utter as heretics they could freely disseminate as Jews."[7] Because they had imbibed the best of Arab culture, becoming learned in science and medicine, Jews traveled in court circles with an air of sophisticated impiety, which again caused resentment among the more pious but less wealthy and powerful.

Jews thus became synonymous with enlightened decadence. "The governors and judges of the cities listened approvingly to heresy put forth by Jews, who were their friends and familiars, and if any one, inflamed by pious zeal, angered these Jews, he was treated as if he had touched the apple of the eye of the ruler; they also taught other Jews to blaspheme Christ and thus the Catholic faith was perverted."[8] Given their number, influence, and sophistication under

Muslim rule, Spain's tolerance of the Jews and their heretical ideas exceeded that of any other European nation. Given their wealth, the Jews engaged in ostentatious display, which increased the odium against them by contrast with the poverty of the Christians. Preachers easily used Jews as material for their sermons, "powerfully aided by the odium which the Jews themselves excited through their ostentation, their usury and their functions as public officials":

> The Oriental fondness for display was a grievous offense among the people. The wealth of the kingdom was, to a great extent, in Jewish hands, affording ample opportunity for the clergy to make invidious comparisons between the opulence of the Jews and the poverty of the Christian multitude, and the lavish extravagance with which they adorned themselves, their women and their retainers, was well fitted to excite envy more potent for evil because more wide-spread than enmity arising from individual wrongs.[9]

The reign of Pedro the Cruel pointed out a paradox that would recur: the more powerful the Jews grew, the more precarious their position became. Tolerance led to violence against the Jews because the Christian majority felt that Pedro the Cruel had given his Jewish retainers control of the government and carte blanche to oppress them culturally and financially. Jews, Walsh reminds us, "were disliked not for practicing the things that Moses taught, but for doing the things he had forbidden. They had profited hugely on the sale of fellow-beings as slaves, and practiced usury as a matter of course, and flagrantly."[10] They were also "much given to proselytizing, even by a sort of compulsion; thus they would force Christian servants to be circumcised, and urged their debtors, sometimes, to abjure Christ. Again, Moses had condemned blasphemers to death. Yet it was a custom of many Jews to blaspheme the Prophet for whom Moses had warned them to prepare."[11]

But the biggest problem was usury. As in the rest of Europe, Christians in Spain were forbidden to take interest on loans, thus granting a monopoly to Jews for a practice which, over a relatively short period, could concentrate all a nation's capital in their hands. As in France at the beginning of the 12th century, Jews were hated because they were money-lenders; money lenders were hated because in a pre-capitalist economy usurious compound interest could quickly ruin anyone caught in its snares. Then Jews could use their financial leverage to exert cultural pressure on Christians to the detriment of faith, morals, and ultimately the social order. Jews were above the law, waging covert cultural warfare against the majority with impunity, a situation bound to lead to resentment. Their activies in certain areas became a reproach to Christian ideals.

Usury was the interface with Christian culture which caused the most resentment. According to Lea, the Jews of Aragon

> were allowed to charge 20 percent per annum, in Castile 33 1/3, and the constant repetition of these limitations and the provisions against all manner of ingenious devices, by fictitious sales and other frauds to obtain an illegal increase, show how little the laws were respected in the grasping avarice with which the Jews speculated on the necessities of their customers. In 1326 the aljama of Cuenca, considering the legal rate of 33 1/3 percent too low, refused absolutely to lend either money or wheat for the sowing. This caused great distress and the town council entered into negotiations, resulting in an agreement by which the Jews were authorized to charge 40 percent. In 1385 the Cortes of Valladolid described one cause of the necessity of submitting to whatever exactions the Jews saw fit to impose, when it says that the new lords, to whom Henry of Trastamara had granted towns and villages, were accustomed to impose on their vassals and starve and torture them to force payment of what they had not got, obliging them to get money from Jews to whom they gave whatever bonds were demanded.[12]

Faced with either starvation or usury, the farmers and small businessmen of 14th century Spain chose usury and watched their prosperity drain into the hands of Jews. Lea claims Jews "recklessly" aided the clergy "in concentrating popular detestation on themselves."[13] As later in Poland, Jews were also hated because they were tax-farmers, which brought them into direct and unpleasant contact with large numbers of Christians. The Church tried to protect her flock from the predations of Jews involved in such activities by reminding rulers that canon law forbade employment of Jews in public office, but rulers then as now, were too intent on short-term gain to consider the long-term consequences, which often swept them from their thrones.

In 1366 Henry of Trastamara mobilized political resentment against Pedro the Cruel and created regime-change in Aragon. When he marched into Spain with an army of French mercenaries, the Jews were the first to suffer. Thousands of Jews were slaughtered; many more took refuge in Paris where the same cycle of usury leading to resentment started again. As one of his first official acts, Henry released Christians in his realm from their debts to the Jews. It was undoubtedly popular, but short-lived. Henry soon realized that if the Jews were unable to extort usurious interest, they couldn't pay taxes or lend the king money. Jews also possessed indispensable financial and administrative skills. Henry, who ascended to the throne on a tide of resentment against Jews, employed the same Jews to remain financially solvent and administer his realm. The cycle of exploitation leading to resentment continued toward social upheaval.

The resentment against usury combined with the suspicion that Jews were thwarting the *Reconquista*, by controlling the reconquered regions with the secret help of the Moors, helped to cause the riots of the late 14th century. When the monarchs did nothing to curb Jewish influence, the outrages

citizens took the law into their own hands; widespread bloodshed resulted. Leniency only created more violence, as when Pedro the Cruel was perceived as giving "his Jewish friends complete control of his government; a circumstance that led his enemies to call him a Jewish changeling," and contributed to his denunciation by the pope.[14] By the end of the 14th century, Spain's Christian population, convinced that the Jews were "planning to rule Spain, enslave the Christians, and establish a New Jerusalem in the West" took the law into their own hands.[15] Widespread bloodshed and widespread conversion (sincere and forced) were the results.

Henry's accession to the throne made the social situation more explosive because the Church was freer to denounce the Jews for their predations and to stimulate popular response. If the social situation was ready to explode into anti-Semitic violence, Ferran Martinez was the spark that set off the explosion. Giving voice to popular grievances in his sermons, he brought the situation into the open. Martinez was Archdeacon of Ecija and the judicial representative of the Archbishop of Seville. Lea calls Martinez "a man of indomitable firmness . . . though without much learning."[16] He claims Martinez was "highly esteemed for his unusual devoutness, his solid virtue and his eminent charity" but then condemns him as a "fanatic" for whom the Jews were "the object of his remorseless zeal."[17]

In 1378, Martinez gave a series of sermons in Seville, claiming the city's 23 synagogues should be razed and Jews should be prevented from contact with Christians. Partly fearing loss of revenue, Henry of Trastamara ordered Martinez to stop inflaming the masses. When Martinez ignored the king's order, the aljama, the Jewish council, of Seville took their case to Rome, which was known for giving the Jews favorable hearings—for a fee, it was rumored—but Martinez ignored the pope as flagrantly as he had ignored the king.

The battle between Martinez and the aljama continued unabated for more than ten years. In 1382, Juan I, Henry's son and successor, reiterated his father's order, but Martinez ignored him too. When the aljama produced three royal letters ordering him to desist in 1388, Martinez replied it was better to obey God than man; he then told the Jews he still intended to have the synagogues razed because they had been erected illegally. The opposition of Rome was now more than pecuniary: *Sicut Judaeis non* specified synagogues were to be left intact and their worshippers unmolested. But the focus of the resentment was clearly motivated by religion. The rapacity of many Jews and their royal protection fueled resentment and threatened the legitimacy of the state. The longer the crown left the issue undecided, the greater the likelihood of insurrection. Popular resentment was also fueled by the murder of Yucaf Pichon, "who had been greatly beloved by all Seville."[18]

To avoid more trouble, the archbishop of Seville suspended Martinez in August, 1389. He was to be tried for heresy and removed from his juridical

offices. He was denied the right to preach until his trial had been con
Within less than a year, however, Archbishop Baroso and King Juan
dead, and the chapter of his order made Martinez one of the provisors
diocese *sede vacante*, thus promoting him into a position to put his
against the Jews into effect. Martinez lost no time. On December 8, he
the clergy under pain of excommunication to tear down the synag
the diocese "within three hours."[9] Towns which housed synagogues
placed under interdict until they were torn down. Martinez was und
emboldened because King Juan I's successor was an 11-year-old invalid
position to stop him.

On January 15, however, the chapter which had just promoted him dep
Martinez of his provisorship, again suspended his preaching faculties,
ordered him to rebuild the synagogues demolished at his command. Mar
remained defiant, declaring he repented of nothing. The mob in Seville
bolder and more defiant too as a result of his continued preaching. When
authorities scourged two mob leaders, the mob was enraged and took its
out on the Jews.

On June 9, 1391, the storm finally broke. The uprising in Seville sack
the *Juderia*, the Jewish Quarter, and 4,000 Jews were killed. Those
were not killed saved their lives by submitting to baptism. Two of the
synagogues were converted into churches for Christians who settled in
quarter that before had housed the town's Jews. The rioting then spread
first to Cordova, then to Toledo and Burgos, until all of Castile was swept
the vortex of anti-Jewish violence. Castile, nominally under the rule of
boy king Henry the Invalid, was in a state of interregnum. No one had
power to stop the rioting, and no one had the power to punish the rioters.
a result, 50,000 people died.

One month after the riots in Seville, a group of boys marched on
Juderia in Valencia crying, "The Archdeacon is coming. The Jews must
between baptism and death."[10] When some of them pushed their way
the gates closed behind them, and those on the outside shouted that
companions were being murdered. When the civil authorities arrived,
Jews, out of fear, refused to open the gate. By thwarting the authorities,
Jews turned events over to the mob, which entered the *Juderia* over the
of adjoining houses and by the old rampart below the bridge. Once inside,
mob sacked the *Juderia*, and hundreds of Jews were murdered. In the Jewish
quarter, the mob demanded what the boys had proposed at the beginning
the riot: baptism or death. The Jews who accepted baptism were spared,
the plundering continued unabated. The mob then broke into the jail
freed its prisoners. They then attacked the Baylia and destroyed the
registers as a way of evading payment of taxes. The same pattern repeated
itself elsewhere as the rioting spread across Spain. In Palma, on the

of Mallorca, three hundred Jews were slain, and the remaining Jews only escaped death by accepting baptism.

In 1395 Henry attained his majority and came to Seville to punish the insurrectionists. Martinez was put on trial, but there is no record of the verdict, an indication that the punishment was trivial if in fact there was any punishment. When Martinez died, he bequeathed a considerable fortune to the Hospital of Santa Maria. In the meantime, nothing was done to punish the assaults, robberies, and murders perpetrated against the Jews. The municipal authorities, who looked the other way when the rioting was in full-swing, blamed the rioting on "little people."

Forced conversion was more often an instrument of the state than the Church. On the eve of the converso crisis, forced conversion seemed the simplest way to calm an explosive social situation which was leading to anarchy and civil war. As Baer notes, "after the conversions, the disorders stopped."[21] The king of Castile was the exception to the rule. In October 1394, after hearing complaints that converted Jews were inciting the population against unconverted Jews, he stated categorically that forced conversion was a violation of civil and canon law, and "those who interfere in this matter, either by persuasion or in any other way, endanger themselves with both God and man."[22]

Once a Jew submitted to baptism, he could walk unharmed through the very mob which only minutes before was determined to kill him. Forced conversion as a political solution had increasing appeal the lower one descended in the hierarchies of Church and State, probably because those were the people most immediately affected by the violence and most immediately in need of a solution. "A pope might find it necessary to protect the human freedom of Jews against the excessive, and inauthentic, zeal of a bishop who saw in forced conversion a simple way to dissolve pluralist tensions in his jurisdictions."[23] Rome was more likely to defend the sincerity of Jewish conversion than a bishop "who was inordinately hesitant to receive converts he thought unreliable in principle."[24]

Not all of the conversions following the turmoil of 1391 were sincere, as numerous Jewish converts themselves indicated. The fear of reprisal created an unfortunate spate of forced conversions, which compounded the problem of subversion that had led to the riots and forced conversions in the first place. Forced conversion is antithetical to the Christian faith. "The unwilling," Pope Gregory the Great wrote at the beginning of a tradition that would remain unchanged throughout the papacy, "are not to be compelled."

Popes throughout the period in question walked a fine line between two extremes, as shown by Poland, which erred by allowing Jews to usurp Christian privilege, and Spain, which erred by promoting forced conversion. Popes protested both abuses, but, in the case of Spain, unscrupulous politicians, seeing in forced conversion a quick fix to a difficult problem, ignored the

warnings and created a deeper, more intractable problem. Many Jews a
baptism to retain their goods and their lives. "Given the forced natu
mass conversions of 1391," Kamen writes, "it was obvious that many o
have been genuine Christians."[27] The king of Aragon repudiated the
of forced conversion and made clear to the Jews there that they could
to their ancestral religion, but that was not the case in Barcelona, whe
became a hotbed of subversive activity until the Spanish Civil War.

Conversion stopped insurrection, which made it clear to the rulers
Royal involvement in forced conversion was a tradition as long stand
Spain as the tradition of suspicion of Jews as subversives. The most consp
advocates of violence to "convert" Jews were the Visigothic kings Rec
and Sisibut. Sisibut felt Jews "had corrupted the minds of the prin
Referring to Sisibut's intentions, St. Isidore of Seville, said "He had zea
not zeal in conformity with knowledge [Rom 10: 2] for he compelled by m
of power those whom he ought to have invited to the faith by reasonin
Isidore of Seville rebuked Sisibut in the name of Pope Gregory the G
The Fourth Council of Toledo added a further caveat. Once converted
was no turning back. Converts, the Council continued, "received the do
sacraments, the grace of baptism, were anointed by the chrism and part
in the Body and Blood of the Lord"; so, "it is proper that they keep the fa
although they admitted to its truth under compulsion."[28]

The Church was caught in the middle. The popes did not condone forc
baptism, but they affirmed that the sacrament of baptism left an indel
mark. The princes were the first to advocate forced baptism to end c
disorder, but they were also the first to allow the Jews to return to their form
way of life once the disorder passed. For them, expediency trumped dogm
Princes and kings needed Jews to lend them money, so they were more like
to allow them to attempt what was theologically impossible, namely, una
the indelible mark of baptism on the soul. Bishops and popes were the fi
to resist forced baptism, but they were also the first to resist the idea that
baptized Jew could return to his former life.

Eventually, the Church took the lead and came down on the side
baptism. If force were so absolute that it overcame all capacity to resist it, th
sacrament was not valid, and the man remained a Jew. If, on the other hand
there was some degree of assent, then the sacrament was valid, and the Jew w
no longer a Jew, and he was subject "to the rigors of canonical penalties shou
he fail to practice his new religion." So, "although Jews cannot be force
to accept baptism, still, if they have in fact received it owing to force, the
cannot now evade the penalties of heretics. . . . a will that is forced remain
a will . . . provided, however, that the force was not absolute."[29] If a Jew wh
converted with a howling mob outside the church during the riots failed t
practice his religion, he was a Christian and subject to the penalties of canon
law. Those who reverted to their former religion were heretics; the punishme

for heresy could be death. The popes "were as consistent in requiring the fulfillment of these obligations on the part of validly baptized Jews as they were in condemning the intemperate zeal that would force the sacrament on an unwilling Jewish adult or his child."[30]

Judaism prescribed in the minutest detail the regulation of daily life, including many dietary laws. A Jewish woman who accepted baptism on Sunday did not wake up on Monday morning with new recipes in her head. The absence of catechesis after conversion meant that old habits were going to perdure. If Jewish prescriptions about the minutiae of daily life had any psychological validity, the perdurance of Jewish ritual would mean the perdurance of Jewish thought, which was oftentimes antithetical to Catholicism.

Moreover, the Jews who were likely to convert were oftentimes the Jews who lacked zeal when it came to what Jews interpreted as biblical law. This group tended to follow a "religion of the intellect" which quickly degenerated into Averroism, a rationalism that would eventually find expression through Jews like Spinoza in the Enlightenment.[31]

As the storm of anti-Semitism spread across Spain, small Jewish communities converted *en masse*. In October 1391, large numbers of Jews converted to Christianity. Many, like cartographer Judah Cresques, were famous. Some conversions were, again, insincere. Isaac Nifoci, the astronomer, converted, but at the first opportunity, he renounced his conversion and sailed to the Holy Land.

Resentment against the Jews had led to widespread rioting in 1391, and that in turn riveted the attention of the Church on the Jews. St. Vincent Ferrer, as a consequence, led crusades for the conversion of the Jews. In 1391 he achieved his most spectacular success when Rabbi Solomon ha-Levi converted to the Catholic faith and became Paul of Burgos or Paul de Santa Maria. Levi was thoroughly conversant with Talmudic literature and acquainted with the leading Jewish scholars of his day. He embraced Christianity after reading Aquinas. His conversion, however, increased the general animus against the Jews because it revealed the evidence of anti-Christian conspiracy from the inside. Paul of Burgos was a Jewish insider if there ever was one, and he implicated the Jews in a conspiracy to overthrow the Christian monarchs of the Iberian Peninsula. After his conversion, Levi published "two dialogues in which he categorically declared that the Jews were bent upon ruling Spain."[32]

St. Vincent Ferrer was in Valencia when the riot broke out there on July 9, 1391. Lea says his presence "may perhaps be an indication that the affair was prearranged."[33] But Lea does not mention that Ferrer was born in Valencia, which makes his presence there not unusual. Ferrer was born in 1350, the same year Pedro the Cruel ascended to the throne. Influenced by the spirit of Raymond of Penafort, Ferrer joined the Dominicans and its crusade to convert the Jews just as social unrest was turning into civil war in Spain.

According to Gheon, Ferrer "hurled himself at the Jewish problem in a kind of frenzy."[34] As a result, he was held responsible for the pogroms, a point Lea raises and then denies. Ferrer was eager to convert the Jews, but he was equally adamant in opposing force to achieve that end. "The apostles," he claimed, "did not carry lances or knives. It is not with knives that Christians must destroy Jews—destroy, that is, the errors that poison their souls and their lives—but by words. When they riot against the Jews they are rioting against God himself. The Jews must come of themselves to baptism."[35] Ferrer also denied the Jews any right to refuse to hear the Gospel preached, which meant any right to avoid listening to his sermons.

The sermons of St. Vincent Ferrer seem to have been miraculous events. Huge crowds assembled; the fact that they heard his words at all in the days before electronic amplification is miracle enough. But people from different parts of Europe understood his sermons even though he preached them in the Valencian dialect, the only language he knew. Lea claims "his Catalan was intelligible to Moor, Greek, German, Frenchman, Italian and Hungarian."[36] He also claims that Ferrer "healed the infirm and repeatedly restored the dead to life."[37] Ferrer tramped from one end of Spain to the other during 1391, and because of his efforts Jews converted by the thousands. "On a single day in Toledo," Lea reports, "he is said to have converted no less than four thousand."[38] Lea, however, can't let the magnitude of his efforts pass unscathed without a hint that Ferrer was responsible for the violence, if only by omission: "It is to be hoped that," he concludes, "in some cases at least, he may have restrained the murderous mob, if only by hiding its victims in the baptismal font."[39] On the eve of the riots, the Jews had regained prosperity. There was no reason to convert for venal reasons. Indeed, few Jews in Spain did convert, "until Saint Vincent, by his preaching and his miracles, began to touch their hearts with pity for the sufferings of the Crucified Jew."[40]

Baer cites the traditionally accepted date of Solomon ha-Levi's baptism as July 21, 1390, but adds "it is more likely that the baptism took place on the 21st of July 1391, in the midst of the great persecution."[41] He cites no evidence for changing the date, but the change undermines the sincerity of ha-Levi's conversion. Even according to Baer, however, Paul of Burgos was no opportunist. His conversion preceded the pogroms of 1391 and may have been prompted by a vision of them, but it went much deeper than the superficial pressure that would prompt conversos to convert for temporal gain.

Baer's account of Levi's conversion emphasizes the coercion of the mob but minimizes Jewish losses in the intellectual battle with the Catholics ever since Donin arranged the disputation over the Talmud in Paris in the mid 13th century. Aquinas' *Summa Contra Gentiles* and Martini's *Pugio Fidei* figured in Levi's conversion, which was not one of "thousands of baptisms" hastily administered so "the frightened Jews" could "keep their goods and their lives."[42] He did not convert under duress. Even Baer says he "should not be

looked upon merely as a careerist whose actions were in no wise influenced by study and religious considerations." Baer adds "There is undoubtedly a grain of truth in the Christian tradition that the works of Thomas Aquinas were the decisive factor in Solomon Halevy's decision to adopt Christianity."[43] Despite hints Levi was a rationalist, Baer claims "he had come to the conclusion that the messianic prophecies had been fulfilled in Jesus of Nazareth," based on a letter Levi wrote to his fellow Jews.[44] One of the Jews, Joshua Halorki, read that letter and expressed shock and dismay at Levy's conversion, but admitted he too had religious doubts. Twenty years later Halorki converted, also as a result of reading Aquinas, Martini, and other disciples of Penafort and listening to the sermons of Vincent Ferrer. Baer states explicitly about Halorki what he only hints about Levi. Halorki's faith, Baer claims, had "long before been undermined."[45] In the letter that expressed his doubts to Levi, Halorki

> reveals anew the character of those Averroist intellectuals who sought to enjoy all the cultural values and treasures of enlightenment, while their ties with the traditions of their own people slackened more and more. Eventually they turned to the Catholic Church, which, though its principles too, were irreconcilable with the religion of their intellect, nevertheless offered them a reasonably coherent system of dogmatics as well as a rich tradition of humanistic and secular culture.[46]

Levi, or Paul of Burgos, followed in the footsteps of his Dominican mentors. He studied at the University of Paris, then returned to Castile, where he rose rapidly in the hierarchy, eventually becoming Bishop of Burgos. In old age, he wrote a polemic, *Scrutinium Scripturarum*, and an addendum to the biblical commentary of Nicolaus de Lyra. Paul was no rationalist however. As the less educated Jews were agitated by messianic visions as the 14th century closed, Paul wrote about predictions of "signs and wonders" which corresponded to the massacres of 1391 and the conversions which followed.

In 1412, as Chancellor of Castile, Paul of Burgos drew up *The Ordenamiento de Dona Catalina*, a rigorous set of regulations which levied stiff penalties on Jews and Moors and attempted to separate them from intercourse with unsuspecting Christians. Jews and Moors were required to wear badges distinguishing them from Christians. They could only dress in coarse cloth and were not allowed to shave or cut their hair so as to appear Christian. They could not change their place of residence; any nobleman from another land who received them if they did was heavily fined and obliged to return them to their previous abode. Any Jew caught trying to leave the country was enslaved. Jews were barred from the higher professions and forbidden to learn the trades of "apothecaries, grocers, furriers, blacksmiths, peddlers, carpenters, tailors, barbers and butchers."[47] They were forbidden to bear arms or to hire Christian servants or to drink, bathe, or eat with Christians or attend their weddings. In short, the *Ordenamiento* established strict segregation as well as powerful

disincentives for living as a non-Christian minority in Spain. Conversion established powerful incentives for conversion.

In 1410, shortly before his death, Rabbi Hasdai Crescas wrote *Or Adonai* deal with the conversions which had swept through the Jewish commun in Spain. According to Rabbi Crescas, the chief cause of conversion "the Greek [i.e., Aristotle] who has dimmed the eyes of Israel in these times."[48] The medieval confrontation with Aristotle exposed the Talmu an unscientific list of opinions and commentaries, constantly turning in itself in more and more convoluted fashion. Averroes opened the Jews Christianity that could accommodate the insights of the Greek philosoph and the Jewish prophets, as Aquinas' synthesis had done. As a res "Men seeking salvation for their souls hoped to find their heart's desire Christianity, which was expounded to the people by great popular orators a highly cultured humanists."[49]

One year after *Or Adonai*, St. Vincent Ferrer arrived in Castile at the he of a band of hundreds so touched by his preaching and his call to repentan that they followed him from town to town flogging themselves in a publi display of penitence. The bands of flagellants terrified the Jews. Those wh did not flee at the sight of the approaching penitents flogging themselves were subjected to St. Vincent's sermons when he entered their synagogues to preac the word of Christ to them, whether they wanted to hear it or not. Ferrer wa adamant in opposing forced conversion, but just as adamant in forcing the Jews to listen to his sermons.

Toward the end of 1412, Ferrer turned his attention to neighboring Aragon While visiting the castle of Caspe and playing a decisive role in raising Fernande de Antiquera to the throne, Ferrer met Joshua Halorki, the pope physician, and engaged him in conversations about conversion. Twenty year earlier, Halorki had written that letter to Solomon Halevy, expressing dismay at the latter's conversion, but also expressing doubts about the Jewish religion The doubts had evidently grown, and when Ferrer pressed the issue, Halorki converted. Halorki then changed his name to Hieronymus de De Sancte Fide and like Levi, directed his attention to his former co-religionists. In August 1412 he presented the Avignonese anti-Pope Benedict XIII with a treatise on the Jews in Latin and Hebrew. The pamphlet must have impressed the pope because it became the seed from which the disputation at Tortosa grew.

In late 1412, Benedict XIII ordered the aljamas of Aragon to send representatives to San Mateo, near Tortosa, for a debate with the newly converted Geronimo de Sancte Fide on the proposition that the Messiah had already come. Attendance was not optional. The Jews tried to get out of attending through bribery and protest, but to no avail. The pope was determined to solve the Jewish question once and for all. Benedict felt the confrontation between Halorki and the rabbis would lead to the extinction of Judaism in Spain. The hopes of the anti-pope were not exaggerated. Three

thousand Jews from Aragon presented themselves for baptism during the debate, including members of the prominent de la Cavalleria family. Aljamas across Aragon converted *en masse*. Baer explains the conversions by claiming "Aragon's Jewry was feeble and exhausted, and there was no king to protect it,"[50] but the disputation would show that the feebleness was intellectual and rooted in the Talmud, which Geronimo Sancte Fe, the former rabbi, knew intimately. Benedict XIII had arranged an all-out cultural offensive against the Jews. While Geronimo de Sancte Fide would engage them in debate, St. Vincent Ferrer would traverse Aragon preaching his miraculous sermons. Few Jews could resist this combination.

Led by Rabbi Vidal ben Veniste de la Cavalleria, a team of 14 rabbis met for debate at the pope's palace on February 7, 1413, under the supervision of Benedict. The following day, the pope laid down the ground rules. The disputation was not a debate between equals; it was rather a form of instruction, according to which the Jews were allowed to defend themselves against charges Geronimo de Sancte Fide would raise. De Sancte Fide, a genius in dividing his opponents, according to Baer, opened the disputation by pitting the writings of the Old Testament against the Talmud.

The Jews, Baer claims, had little time to prepare, although they had been in Tortosa for a month preceding the disputation. On the second day of the disputation, Rabbi Joseph Albo "got entangled in self contradictions. . . and the Jewish multitude present laughed at him and considered him defeated."[51] The discussion involved the Messiah. Some of the rabbis brought up the Aggada of the Palestinian Talmud that suggested the Messiah had been born on the day the Temple had been destroyed and that he had remained alive since then in an earthly Paradise, and that occasionally he would appear at the gates of Rome. When the pope asked whether it was possible for the messiah to live such a long time, Rabbi Astruc Halevi snapped back that it was no less plausible than what Christians believed about their Messiah. Rabbi Astruc then claimed the Jews didn't need a messiah for the salvation of their souls—"because their souls would be saved even if the messiah never came"—but rather for the restoration of their political kingdom.[52] The pope reminded the rabbi, if that were the case the Jews needed no messiah at all, and Rabbi Astruc "had to apologize."[53]

The disputants demonstrated very different notions of what the Messiah was supposed to do. The gentiles longed for release from the bondage of sin and for the salvation of their souls; the Jews "await[ed] a messianic king who will build the earthly Jerusalem."[54] The Talmudic messiah was "a lofty personage, a man born of a human being, and his act of redemption will be to bring the bodies out of slavery into freedom, to raise the Jewish people to a state of enduring prosperity, to build the Temple and to maintain it in splendor. All admit that such a messiah has not yet arrived."[55] If nothing else, the disputation showed that the Jews were seeking a messiah different from

the one whom the Christians said had already arrived. The Christia... the Messiah as "a God-man, while the Jewish definition is that of a ... human being. The function of the Christian Messiah is to save souls ... Hell, which the Jewish messiah is to keep the Jewish bodies out of servitu...

The Jews were handicapped by the ground rules of the debate, which ... place in an "irksome atmosphere of political pressure and moral coerci... But the Jews faced internal difficulties too. Virtually all their fundam... difficulties revolved around the Talmud. The Talmud was an esoteric ... written by rabbis solely for rabbis, and never intended to be the obje... public debate. As a result, when the Talmud's more embarrassing pas... were dragged into the light by converts who were former rabbis, the J... didn't know what to say. The Disputation of Tortosa thus followed the ... pattern as Donin's attack on the Talmud a century and a half before.

On June 15, 1414, Geronimo de Sancte Fide read "some Talmudic pas... which should have been censored," and asked the Jews if they were re... to defend them.[58] The Jews, who probably decided to maintain sile... beforehand, gave no reply. Geronimo took the Jews' silence as proof they w... "dumbfounded and bewildered."[59] Baer does not dispute the claim, but ad... as justification "it was naturally not pleasant for the Jews to have to disc... such passages before the tribunal."[60] The Jews, quite simply, could not defe... their own sacred texts. In the minutes of July 7, 1414, they are recorded ... saying::

> The Jews here assembled from all the communities in the kingdom. . . declare that because of their ignorance and lack of enlightenment, they are unable to rebut the arguments of Hieronymus [de Sancte Fide] against the talmudic sayings cited by him, and do not know how to defend those sayings. They are, nevertheless, firmly convinced that, were the authors of those sayings now alive, they would have known how to defend them because, as wise and good men, they could not have uttered any unseemly statements.[61]

This may be sly irony, but it was hardly convincing apologetics. The rabbi... then petitioned the pope to allow them to go home "inasmuch as they di... not have among them a champion competent and worthy of defending th... Talmud."[62] The rabbis added "their weakness was not to be taken as a reflection... upon the Talmud,"[63] but it certainly seemed that way.

Jerome of the Holy Faith was aided by another rabbi convert, Andrea... Betrandi, a scripture scholar in the employ of the pope. When the two former... rabbis reminded the Jews that one false statement in the Talmud would... disqualify the entire book, and when they reminded them that this was the... criterion used to condemn the writings of Maimonides, Rabbi Astruc Halev... responded

> Taken literally, the talmudic passages quoted by Magister Andreas and Magister Hieronymus seemed to be heretical, inconsistent with good morals and fallacious. According to the traditional view taken by his teachers, however, these passages were to be interpreted in another sense. He himself admitted that he did not know the correct interpretation and did not intend to defend the passages; he therefore withdrew all his previous statements.[64]

Baer says it is "most unlikely that the Jews had nothing more to say," and they "were eager to hurry back to their communities no matter what, so as to try to save them from impending disintegration and collapse," but their eagerness could also be interpreted as discomfort at not knowing what to say.[65] Before long it became clear that the Jews had lost the battle. They were incapable of defending their most sacred writings. The Jews had written the Talmud to support their religion; they had then turned that religion into a manifestation of the Talmud by claiming that it was "more binding that the Torah itself," but for the second time in as many centuries, the most learned Jews could not defend their writings in the court of reason.[66]

Baer tries to explain this failure by saying the rabbis had been infected with "Averroism" and therefore "the Torah had lost its taste and fragrance and ceased to yield its strength," but the Torah was not at issue, because the Christians accepted it as their sacred text as well (though not, of course, what the Hebrews would call the 'oral' Torah).[67] The Christians asserted exclusive rights over the Torah and cited the blasphemies of the Talmud as proof that the Jews had abandoned the religion of Abraham and Moses. Baer claims "Judaism was inconsistent with the religion of reason," but the disputation showed something slightly different.[68] It showed the Talmud was inconsistent with reason *and* inconsistent with the Torah as well. The issue was the Talmud, which had become the heart of the Jewish religion, distorting the Torah and shielding it from its true and infallibly protected interpretation by the Church in the light of the New Covenant upon which She is founded (the failing of the Jews regarding the Torah is also a failing of messianic Christian heretics who in many ways imitate the Jews in belief and practice). The issue was also the Jewish inability to defend the Talmud. Once the rabbis could not defend the Talmud against the attacks of former rabbis, Judaism was perceived as irrational, outdated, and not worth defending. Jews as a result began to convert in large numbers even before the debate ended. "In March 1413 and the following months," Baer says,

> Jews appeared in Tortosa, singly at first and then in groups, declaring that after listening to the feeble arguments of their rabbis they had decided to become Christians. Others were baptized in their own localities. On February 2, 1414, some members of the de la Cavalleria family and their

households were baptized. Within a few weeks several of these men, [illegible] Christian names, held important administrative and political posts.

Solomon de Piera, the aged poet, joined Don Vidal de la Cavalleria, the [illegible] chief disputant, in converting to Christianity. Baer says, "Such faithl[illegible] on the part of educated Jews of good family, who had been bred [illegible] Hebrew tradition with its cultural treasures, was already quite comm[illegible] . Nevertheless, each and every instance of betrayal cut the loyal Jews [illegible] heart."[70] Baer feels "the king was inviting the two de la Cavallerias to hi[illegible] mainly for political and practical reasons," but the defection was devas[illegible] nonetheless, "to the remnant of Spanish Jewry it must indeed have se[illegible] as if the sun had set with the apostasy of Don Vidal."[71] Rabbis like Be[illegible] compared the Jews who did not convert to "grain forgotten in the fi[illegible] it was "only by sheer accident were they not swept away by the tempe[illegible] apostasy."[72]

The conversions continued into 1414, when Astruc Rimoch, "a physi[illegible] and poet of Fraga who had protected faithful Jews in 1391, converted [illegible] Christianity together with his son, also a physician and assumed the na[illegible] of Magister Franciscus de Sant Jordi."[73] The rabbis were perplexed; they co[illegible] not explain why so many Jews converted. Baer returns again and again [illegible] "Averroism" as the most plausible explanation: "our pious men believe th[illegible] philosophical contemplation," which is to say, "knowledge of the boo[illegible] of nature and of Aristotelian metaphysics" is "more important than th[illegible] performance of the commandments."[74] There were external factors too. "The[illegible] is reason to assume that Vincent Ferrer's sermons made an impression up[illegible] both humble and educated classes, and that the Church's 'victory' at Tortos[illegible] bewildered many."[75] In the aftermath of the disputation, St. Vincent Ferr[illegible] continued to march through Aragon with his band of flagellants, forcing th[illegible] Jews to listen to his sermons, and many Jews converted there as well.

Two years after Vincent Ferrer's flagellants marched through Aragon[illegible] Benedict XIII was deposed. The king died a few months later, and [illegible] psychological reaction set in. The frenzy had worn out the Spanish natio[illegible] psychologically. As normal life resumed, some of the old and the new [illegible] Christians fell into the habits that had sustained them before the conversions. [illegible] The Ordenamiento of Dona Catalina fell into desuetude. As the old habits [illegible] reasserted themselves, the suspicion spread that the conversions of the new [illegible] Christians were insincere. "Given the forced nature of the mass conversions of [illegible] 1391," Kamen writes, "it was obvious that many could not have been genuine [illegible] Christians."[76] As a result, the conversos were regarded with suspicion as a fifth [illegible] column within the Church. Terms of opprobrium were applied to them, the [illegible] most common being marrano, a word of obscure origin.

Chapter Six

The Revolution Arrives in Europe

> It is clear that the Gospel, rendered purely natural (and, therefore, absolutely debased), becomes a revolutionary ferment of extraordinary violence.[Q1]
>
> – Jacques Maritain, *Three Reformers*

> Whenever a party in Christendom opposes itself to the ruling church, it assumes a tinge of the Old Testament, not to say Jewish, spirit.[Q2]
>
> – Heinrich Graetz, *History of the Jews*

In 1412, the "revolutionary storm" broke unexpectedly over Bohemia. According to Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini, Bohemia had more beautiful churches and monasteries than any other kingdom in Europe. Aeneas Silvius's claim was no idle boast; he had traveled widely through Europe on the Church's business. He also wrote a history of Bohemia, took part in the Council of Basel, and eventually became head of the Catholic Church as Pope Pius II.

Prague's Jewish community was the most important in Bohemia. Jews in Bohemia invariably found their way to Prague, a center of European usury, and the "money business created over time a widespread network of familial and business connections that extended far beyond the borders of Bohemia."[1]

Prague had been linked directly to Spain by the slave trade since antiquity. Archbishop Agobard of Lyon reported that at the time of Louis the Pious, Jews were involved in slave traffic, importing pagan slaves from the Slavic lands east of the Holy Roman Empire. Jewish merchants trafficking in slaves, Bavarian salt, Bohemian wax, and horses, would stop regularly in Prague from the ninth-century onwards. Cosmas, the Czech chronicler, said in the 10th century that Jews had been in Prague so long that no one knew when they had first settled there, although he speculated they lived in Prague from the time of the Roman Emperor Vespasian.[2]

The trade in German and Slavic slaves began in Berlin. The slaves then sent to Prague and from there to Venice and then to Cordoba. the Jewish commercial network was also an intelligence network, wh happened in Cordoba was discussed in Prague and vice versa. And muc happening in both places. Jews were converting in unprecedented numb Spain, and those who did not convert were looking nervously for a safe p to land. And Bohemia, the jewel of central European Catholic and mo culture, was on the verge of the first full-blown revolution on European s

Trouble had been brewing in Prague for years. Ordained a priest in 14 one year later John Huss became dean of the philosophy faculty at the Ch University, founded in 1348 at the pinnacle of Prague's golden age to ho Charles the Great. Charles University would prove less a monument than occasion for the undoing of that Golden Age. After Anne of Bohemia marr King Richard II of England, probably in 1382, the University of Pra became a conduit of subversive English thought, particularly the ideas of Jo Wycliffe, a professor of heretical leanings who became the pride of Oxf University when he was appointed Doctor there in 1371. Prague Univers prominence increased in 1383 when the Dominicans transferred their Pari college to Prague as a result of the Great Schism. By 1390 Bohemian stude were studying at Oxford, and Wycliffe's philosophical works were bei copied and discussed in Prague. John Huss was one of the scribes.

Wycliffe's ecclesiology made dangerous inroads into the mind of Jo Huss. Wycliffe does not distinguish between Church and State. He us "Regnum," "ecclesia" and "respublica" interchangeably. Huss soon talk about the "regnum" or realm as a salvationary community. "The politic ecclesiology of Wycliffe had defined the body politic of the realm as a ecclesia, an autonomous section of the Church Militant, and had seen th secular powers of the realm as also the rulers of the church."[3] Wycliffe was a advocate of returning to the Primitive Church. An alliance of ill omen formed between those who espoused the "evangelical ideal" and those who wanted t "justify the nationalization of the English church and the secularization of he property."[4] This idea would reach fruition in England when Henry VIII put in motion the theft of the monasteries from the Church and their distribution t families—Cecil, Russell, Cromwell, et al—who would become the backbo of what William Cobbett regarded as a revolutionary movement there. Joh Huss would do the same thing sooner in Bohemia.

Wycliffe was both a Donatist and an Erastian. He believed a sacrament validity was a function of the soul of the celebrant and transformed this ide into a political weapon to justify appropriation of Church property by th "realm." According to Huss, "The temporal lords can, as they judge prope take temporal goods away from habitually delinquent ecclesiastics."[5] In Huss ecclesiology, that meant "clerics so stubbornly habituated and hardened t evil as obviously to be in mortal sin."[6] This doctrine was music to the ears

the greedy nobility, who had long looked with envy on the Church's property in Bohemia, where 50 percent of the land was in Church hands.

One by one the ingredients that made up the stew of revolution took their place in Huss's mind where they simmered through years of public activity as a professor and a preacher. The idea of the realm as a salvationary community enabled an ethnic group to appropriate models from the Old Testament and define itself as a "holy nation," whose purpose was spreading heaven on earth by the sword, which became the essence of the revolutionary ideology. The idea of the realm as salvific community also explains "how the pietistic religious movements of the 14th century, passing though the medium of Huss's leadership in the early 15th emerged as the mutiny of 1414-5 and the revolution of the following decade."[7]

Huss, like Wycliffe, appealed first to the example of the Primitive Church. That appeal soon went beyond the Primitive Church of the New Testament to a more appropriate object of imitation in the Old, Joshua leading his people in battle against flesh and blood foes, not against the principalities and powers the Church fought. Huss's appropriation of Wycliffe's conflation of *regnum* and *ecclesia* "encouraged others to revolt."[8] Rome became the Antichrist, and Huss's followers longed for "that blessed hour when the Whore of Revelation will be stripped bare and her flesh consumed by the fire of tribulation," as Nicholas of Dresden, one of Huss's followers, put it.[9] The appeal to judaizing primitivism expressed "a general and comprehensive rejection of the Roman system, a kind of total alienation from the status quo."[10] In statements like that of Nicholas of Dresden, "we breathe the atmosphere of revolution, with evangelical love, humility and suffering displaced by the fanatical hatred that so often forms their psychological correlate."[11] We breathe, in other words, the toxic vapors of the revolutionary movement.

Huss was appointed preacher at the Bethlehem Chapel in Prague in 1402. Wealthy benefactors created the Chapel in the 1390s to promote preaching in the Czech language. The confluence of Wycliffe's heretical ideas and nascent Czech nationalism spawned a powerful political movement, which immediately became the vehicle for messianic politics. Huss's followers were soon carrying the Conflation of *ecclesia* and *respublica* to its logical conclusion. Jerome of Prague, who would follow his master to the stake, called Bohemia "a holy nation" in his sermons and claimed the "Law of God" could be identified with "the national community loyal to King Wenceslas, the realm of Bohemia."[12] John of Jesenice took the idea a step further ideologically and a step backward toward its Jewish source when he claimed the Bohemians' relationship to King Wenceslas was comparable to Israel's relationship to God, a comparison that encouraged the King's appropriation of the Church's worldly goods. As later in England, the appeal to Scripture, to the example of the Primitive Church, and to Israel provided intellectual cover for revolution among the masses and justification for the greed of the princes.

Huss's idea that Bohemia was a "holy nation" led the Czechs inexo
into conflict with other ethnic groups, particularly the Germans, w
constituted a significant minority in Prague and the northern and we
sections of the kingdom. The conflict first surfaced at the university, wh
it took on philosophical trappings. Since most Germans were Okham
nominalists, the Czechs gravitated via Wycliffe into the realist ca
Huss's German colleagues at the university orchestrated a condemnat
of Wycliffe's teachings in 1403. Undeterred, Huss continued to prom
Wycliffe, and in 1408 his priestly faculties were suspended. Proving himse
a master of academic politics, Huss orchestrated a successful counter-attac
persuading the king to disenfranchise the German "nations" at the univers
After Huss's coup, more than a thousand Germans decamped for Leipz
where they started their own university in 1409. The University of Prague lo
the esteem of the academic community throughout Europe, but it becam
a more effective instrument for Wycliffite propaganda, which became mo
revolutionary under Huss's guidance. Rome and Prague were on a collisio
course.

In December 1409, the disputed Pope Alexander V condemned Wycliffite
and forbade most public preaching. When the bull was made public in Prague
Huss, who had repeatedly attacked the papacy in sermons at Bethlehem
Chapel, was clearly the object of the pope's ire. Huss was not cowed. Hu
appealed the bull to the archbishop on the day it appeared. More defiantly, h
read it aloud at Bethlehem Chapel to elicit support. The Archbishop of Prague
sided with the pope. At his request, Canon Zdenek burned 200 volumes o
heretical material, including most probably books Huss had transcribed
The archbishop then fled from Prague to his castle at Roudnice, but no
before excommunicating Huss and his followers for grave and pertinacious
disobedience.

Huss responded in accord with the Wycliffite doctrine of the salvific
regnum by upping the ante. Huss took his heretical doctrines and used them
as a springboard to revolution by invoking the Old Testament. "Will you
stand with me?" Huss asked the congregation at Bethlehem Chapel after his
excommunication became public. When the people responded affirmatively
in Bohemian, "We will and we do," Huss knew where to take them next.
"The time has come for us," he said to the eager congregation, "*just as it did
for Moses in the Old Testament*, to take up our swords and defend the law of
God."[13]

Huss's contemporaries were shocked and outraged by his boldness. Peter of
Unicov, the Dominican Master in Prague, publicly denounced Huss's sermons
as "a summons to the people to take their swords and strike their fathers and
mothers dead."[14] Clerical appeals to revolutionary violence in the name of
Old Testament figures were soon commonplace. Jerome of Prague preached
sermons that seethed with revolutionary violence against Rome and the

Germans. Jerome not only encouraged others to take up the sword, he carried one himself, much to the scandal of traditionalist clergy. Brandishing a sword, Jerome chased preachers of indulgences out of churches throughout Prague. He also used a sword to capture three monks he suspected of exhibiting false relics. Sword in hand, he took two to the civil authorities and imprisoned the third. Putting his sword aside, he beat the Franciscan preacher Benes of Boleslav with his fists. He was also a master of cultural and psychological terrorism, engaging in a propaganda campaign against Ernest of Carinthia and leading mobs in three incidents where they broke into churches and smeared excrement on crucifixes. He justified these acts of violence and impiety by appealing to the Czech nation as the New Israel. If Jerome of Prague were unable to invoke Moses, he would have been considered a common thug. With Moses and Israel on his lips, Jerome took thuggery to a new level, the level of revolutionary activity. Once Israel got invoked, Jerome was not a renegade priest or a sword-wielding cultural terrorist; he was Joshua leading the Bohemian Israelites, the "holy nation," into battle with "Edom," the heretics who were invariably German and loyal to Rome.

Huss could not have led a congregation of Catholics into rebellion against the Church of Rome without invoking the Old Testament. Huss and his followers had already described the Czechs as "a holy nation." Unlike the "New Israel," warned by Jesus that those who lived by the sword would die by it, the Bohemian zealots who conflated "*regnum*" and "*ecclesia*" could spread the gospel with the sword because Bohemia was their "*ecclesia*," and their religion, derived from the messianic politics which revolutionaries from the time of Simon bar Kokhba had gleaned from the Old Testament. Since there was only one "holy nation," Bohemians became the "New Israel" by default.

The concept "holy nation" as a conflation of the secular "*regnum*" with the spiritual "*ecclesia*" is a Jewish idea. The Hussite revolution was, at its core, a rejection of the Roman Church and its adherence to Christ's claim that his kingdom was not of this world. The popes would term the idea that a holy nation wielding the sword could create heaven on earth a return to the vomit of Judaism. This was the essence of revolution then, and revolutionaries from Bar Kokhba to Trotsky have remained faithful to this creed. Many Jewish commentators have noticed the underlying congruity between Talmudic Judaism and revolution. Calling Huss, "a Czech priest" who had "loosened the bonds in which the church had ensnared the minds of men,"[15] Heinrich Graetz notes

> the flames. . . fired a multitude in Bohemia, who entered on a life and death struggle with Catholicism. ***Whenever a party in Christendom opposes itself to the ruling church, it assumes a tinge of the Old Testament, not to say Jewish spirit.*** The Hussites regarded Catholicism, not unjustly, as heathenism, and themselves as Israelites, which must wage holy war

against Philistines, Moabites and Ammonites. Church and monasteries were to them the sanctuaries of a dissolute idolatry, temples to Baal and Moloch and groves of Ashtaroth to be consumed with fire and sword [my emphasis].[16]

Millennialism played an increasingly prominent role in the revolutionary mind. Millennialism was a derivation of two biblical texts—Daniel 7, describing the "fourth beast" or kingdom in Daniel's dream and Revelation 20, describing the reign of a thousand years. According to Daniel (7: 23-27),

The fourth beast
is to be a fourth kingdom on earth,
different from all other kingdoms.
It will devour the whole earth,
trample it underfoot and crush it.
As for the ten horns: from this kingdom
will rise ten kings, and another after them;
this one will be different from the previous one
and will bring down three kings;
he is going to speak words against the Most High,
and harass the saints of the Most High.
He will consider changing seasons and the Law,
and the saints will put into his power
for a time, two times and half a time.
But a court will be held and his power will be stripped from him,
consumed and utterly destroyed.
And sovereignty and kingship,
and the splendors of all the kingdoms under heaven
will be given to the people of the saints of the Most High.
His sovereignty is an eternal sovereignty
and every empire will serve and obey him.

Historically Daniel is referring to Alexander the Great as the fourth beast. His kingdom split after his death into two main divisions, the Seleucids and the Ptolemies, but its reign is only temporary. His kingdom will be succeeded by a kingdom which has "an eternal sovereignty." Revelation (20: 1-3) complements Daniel's vision by describing the thousand year reign of Christ on earth that begins when "an angel" came "down from heaven with the key of the Abyss in his hand and an enormous chain." The angel then "overpowered the dragon, that primeval serpent which is the devil and Satan, and chained him up for a thousand years. He threw him into the Abyss, and shut the entrance and sealed it over him, to make sure that he would not deceive the nations again until the thousand years had passed. At the end of that time, he must be released, but only for a short while." When St. John wrote his Apocalypse, the

fourth beast was associated with Rome, specifically with the persecutions of Nero, which took a terrible toll on the nascent Christian church.

Roughly four centuries later, St. Augustine would propose the definitive interpretation of these passages in *The City of God*. The book of Revelation was understood not in a literal historical sense but as a spiritual allegory. The Millennium had begun with Christ's death on the Cross and would continue until the Second Coming, when the Antichrist would reign for three and a half years before Christ returned in glory to judge the living and the dead and end time and human history. To consider the Millennium as anything other than the dispensation of the New Israel, the Catholic Church, was declared a heresy and a superstitious aberration by the Council of Ephesus in 431. In spite of this condemnation, Millennialism "persisted in the obscure underworld of popular religion."[7] And it would come to the fore whenever a movement challenged the Church's claim to be the "New Israel." Invariably, each heretical sect would identify the fourth beast with the Church of Rome, and each would avidly ascribe to itself the event that would inaugurate the Millennium on earth. The Fifth Monarchy men at the time of Cromwell are a prominent example, but by no means exceptional. Their calculations were strikingly similar to those of the Taborites, the revolutionary wing of the Hussite party that established itself as the revolutionary *avant garde* by force in the summer of 1420.

There is another interpretation of Revelation 20. Those who refused to succumb to the persecutions of the fourth beast made up Rome, and reigned for literally one thousand years—the period between Alaric's sack of Rome in 410, the date conventionally given for the fall of Rome, and the first outbreak of revolution in Europe, when Huss was excommunicated and gave his revolutionary sermon at the Bethlehem Chapel in 1410.

If there were one institution associated with this thousand-year reign in Europe it was the monastery. Nothing symbolized the Roman religion better than the monasteries. The monastery, which antedated the Rule of St. Benedict, its most enduring norm, encouraged men to live like angels on earth by proposing a way to live the counsels of perfection which Christ proposed to the rich young man in the Gospel (Mt. 19: 21). When the rich young man asks Jesus what he must do "to possess eternal life," Jesus tells him to "keep the commandments." When the young man replies by saying that "I have kept all these. What more do I need to do?" Jesus tells him "If you wish to be perfect, go and sell what you own and give the money to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven; then come and follow me." Jesus' boldness shows the radically supernatural character of the New Covenant, which the Fathers of the Church stressed. The commandments are natural; the counsels of perfection are supernatural; they transcend a man's natural inclinations—sex, food, money, autonomy—which the commandments regulate by confining within the bounds of reason: "You must not kill. You

must not commit adultery. You must not bring false witness. Honor your father and mother, and: you must love your neighbor as yourself." The new way involves a radical departure from the natural order. Sell everything you have, give the money to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven; then come follow me. Thus the monastic vows of poverty, chastity and obedience, all flowing from the absence of money. Those who did not marry did not need money to support their families, nor did they need the autonomy necessary to use that money wisely as heads of households. They could live like angels on earth.

Monasticism preserved the culture of antiquity when the predations of the barbarian tribes threatened to destroy civilization after the collapse of the empire in the fifth-century. The Rule of St. Benedict enabled establishment of stable autonomous communities and a cultural lingua franca, the Christianization of classical culture that prevented Europe from disintegrating into a patchwork of warring ethnicities. Monasticism did this according to the letter of the Gospel, not by the sword but by gentle example. Like the mustard seed that became the tree in which the birds of the air found shelter, the monasteries gathered in the marauding barbarian tribes and civilized them. Like the yeast that inexorably but imperceptibly suffused the lump of dough to raise it, the monasteries raised the level of European culture by integrating Christianity, classical culture, and local ethnic identity into one powerful whole. The Benedictine monks who sailed down the Danube from Regensburg brought the Gospel and culture in its most practical and mundane forms. A Roman senator sent to administer the border provinces along the Danube said it was the unhappiest place on earth because its inhabitants had neither grapes nor olives. The Benedictines brought grapes, transforming the wilderness into a garden, a vineyard, and an orchard—all still standing today, bearing fruit over a hundred-fold over the thousand year reign of Benedict in Europe.

The monasteries became wealthy in the mundane sense by ignoring wealth. The individual monks renounced money, but their labors produced enormous wealth for the monasteries. That wealth grew over generations because the monks did not have children or the expenses they require. More importantly, their lands were not constantly divided as children inherited the land from their fathers. The monks who had turned their backs on wealth ended up living lives of wealth, and wealth led to moral decay. The enemies of the Gospel used that moral decay to justify their attack on a supernatural way of life deeply repugnant to the carnal mind.

Christ told his followers that those who live according to the Gospel will elicit hatred from the carnal; the monasteries were no exception. Jews would always symbolize those wise in the ways of the world, but blind to higher realities. Those who loathed the order the Church imposed on Europe allied themselves with Jews to vent their fury on those who lived according to laws that transcended nature. A wealthy Church will soon attract those with no

taste for the counsels of perfection even if they have to take vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience to gain access to that wealth. Wealth can promote its own decline. Carnal clerics fuel resentment and oftentimes manifest the very resentment their own immoral behavior has fostered in others. John Zelivsky, the apostate monk, would be a good example of just that sort of behavior.

Cohn claims that the resentment arising from poverty created the Hussite revolution. Heymann disagrees; he says that largely because of laws designed to attract German settlers, the lot of the Bohemian peasant was significantly better than in the rest of Europe. "At no time again until the early 19th century" were "Bohemia's peasants. . . as relatively well off as in the period preceding the Hussite wars."[18] Slavery, the engine that drove wages down, "had disappeared in Bohemia in the course of the 12th century."[19] Heymann contends the Church owned 50 percent of the land in Bohemia, and as such had an insurmountable advantage over peasants and the princes, who gradually united in resentment of monastic renunciation and the prosperity and moral laxity it engendered. The peasants, a "revolutionary class"[20] at Tabor, were unhappy because the wages the monks received, no matter what they did or did not do, were consistently higher than what the peasants and the proletariat could demand. Once the peasantry caught the millennial virus, no economic calculus was applicable, because what was then at stake was not better wages but heaven on earth. To the carnal and uneducated peasant, the destruction of the monasteries took on a numinous quality. Destruction of the monasteries, perhaps more than any theory about communion under both species, united the revolutionary movement.

This strain of messianic politics made the Hussite revolution different from the great English peasant revolt of 1381 or the Pastoreux uprising in France in 1320. The Hussite revolution is "inexplicable" as "a purely socio-economic development."[21] "They," said one Hussite referring to Rome, "have introduced as necessary for the kingdom of God, Greek rules, Aristotelic justice, Platonic sanctity, and gentile rites and honor."[22] The Hussites would have none of this. Like the Muslims before them and the Puritans after them, they were willing to burn down whatever edifice contained more than their understanding of the word of God. To bring about the kingdom of God, then, the Holy Nation of the Bohemian warriors had to destroy the monasteries. Once that repository of secularized Christianity or the "*mulier fornicaria*" which the Bohemians identified with Rome had been destroyed, heaven on earth would rise phoenix-like from the ashes of the burned monasteries.

While Huss was urging his congregation to take up the sword, one Bohemian was doing just that, but not in Bohemia. In July 1410, John Zizka of Trocnov fought in the Battle of Gruenwald at which the Polish nobility decisively defeated the territorial ambitions of the Teutonic Knights in Prussia. Of the 50 divisions constituting the Polish army at Gruenwald, two were composed entirely of Czechs, and three in part.

Zizka, an impoverished squire who was blind in one eye, spent his younger years organizing hunts for the king. He also engaged in brigandage, plundering the estates of the local magnate Lord Oldrich Rosenberk, a man Zizka would plague his entire life. At the Battle of Gruenwald, Zizka witnessed medieval warfare in all its panoply but left the field unimpressed. Since the invention of the stirrup, the major offensive weapon in armed combat had been the cavalry. Zizka realized that the aristocratic army of armored knights on horseback could be neutralized by judicious use of terrain. Armed horsemen were unbeatable on an open plain, but they were not as effective charging uphill, especially if the defenders surrounded themselves with trenches and portable fortifications and made judicious use of the newly developed firearms, especially at close range. The Golden Lane at Hradcany Castle in Prague had traditionally been home to the King's alchemists, and one of their tasks was developing firearms and potent gunpowder. That tradition has continued to this day with the production of Semtex, developed in Czechoslovakia during the Communist era and the preferred explosive of terrorists during the 1970s. Zizka would use Czech expertise in explosives in unprecedented ways, changing the face of warfare.

When Zizka returned to Bohemia in 1411, he bought a house in Prague, intending to settle there as one of the king's retainers. One of his duties was to accompany Queen Sophie to chapel; since the queen was attending Bethlehem Chapel, Zizka imbibed Huss's messianic Bohemian nationalism *ex fontem*. He also ran head on into Huss's conflict with the pope and the local bishop, which was reaching its climax when Zizka returned from the Prussian wars.

On June 12, 1411, Archbishop Zbynek placed all of Prague under interdict, which meant that none of the sacraments could be confected there. King Wenceslas told Praguers to ignore the bishop, fostering Huss' agenda of creating a national church. If the king could lift an interdict, then his power exceeded that of the bishop, and even that of the pope. In meddling in spiritual affairs, Wenceslas may have been influenced by the Wycliffite doctrine of the supremacy of lords temporal in matters spiritual, which had been preached at the Bethlehem Chapel. Vindicated by the king's defiance, Huss continued to preach sermons derived from Wycliffe, and the masses who attended Bethlehem Chapel edged closer to revolution.

Wenceslas, though, was motivated by something less lofty than philosophical principles. In 1412 Pope John XXIII called for a crusade against King Ladislaus of Naples. To finance this campaign, the pope authorized the sale of indulgences. When papal representatives arrived in Prague to sell indulgences, the king did an abrupt *volte face* and sided with the pope because he stood to benefit financially from indulgences sold in his realm. Huss denounced the sale of indulgences: "The papal legate sold whole deaconries, towns and cities to unworthy clerics living in concubinage" and

to other unsavory characters, who then "taxed the population as much as they wished."[23] The pope then confirmed Huss's excommunication and the interdict on Prague. The pope also denounced Bethlehem Chapel as a "nest of heretics" and demanded it be torn down, which the pope's supporters attempted while Huss was inside preaching.[24]

Since the king had sided with the pope on indulgences, he could not contravene this interdict, and a stalemate existed until Huss resolved the impasse by leaving Prague. On 15 October 1412, unwilling to deprive the city of divine services and access to the sacraments, John Huss left Prague and went into voluntary exile. For almost two years, Huss lived in the castle Kozi Hradek and worked in the countryside of Bohemia, writing books and preaching wherever and whenever opportunity allowed. In exile, Huss continued his agitation against the Church, preaching open-air sermons to peasants, whose gatherings foreshadowed the mass Taborite rallies after his death. The propaganda campaign in Prague continued in his absence under the direction of Jerome of Prague. The Manifesto of 1412, a part of that propaganda campaign, again appealed to the sword and the patriarchs of the Old Testament as a summons to revolutionary battle against the Roman Catholic Church, now identified by Jakoubek of Stribro and others as the Antichrist: "And so, dear holy community in Bohemia," the Manifesto concludes,

> let us stand in battle line with our head, Master Huss, and our leader, Master Jerome; and whoever will be a Christian, let him turn to us. Let everyone gird on his sword, let brother not spare brother, nor father spare son, nor son father, nor neighbor spare neighbor. . . . All should kill so that we can make our hands holy in the blood of the accursed ones, as Moses shows us in his books; for what is written there is an example to us.[25]

The outcome was predictable. Demonstrations in the streets led to assaults on priests and a number of arrests. The mob talked about a radical change of governance, a revolution, based on Huss's translation of Wycliffe's ideas. In particular, Wycliffe claimed that "dominion," the right to rule, resulted from grace. So sin, which meant the loss of grace, meant the loss of political legitimacy. Sin transformed a legitimate ruler into a usurping tyrant who could be swept from office by a "holy nation", e.g., the mob in the streets of Prague.

The propaganda campaign against the Church lasted from 1412 until the revolution of 1419. The Hussites staged obscene and blasphemous processions throughout Prague, ridiculing the official church through songs, pictures, and dramaturgy. As before, the magnet for popular wrath was the monasteries. Jerome of Prague was involved in three separate attacks on monasteries in 1414, in which excrement was smeared on crucifixes, one of his favorite psychological warfare techniques.

Heymann calls Zizka "the implacable destroyer of those whom he considered as the arch sinners: the monks."[26] Zizka's hatred of the monks was notorious, so notorious that a legend that his sister had been raped by a monk was created to explain his hatred. Zizka was drawn to the Czech nationalism promoted by revolutionary priests. Both Zizka and the priests began by identifying *ecclesia* with *regnum* and then moved to the creation of a *de facto* national church. When Jerome of Prague referred to Bohemia as a "holy nation," he made no distinction between *regnum* and *ecclesia*. Similarly, the ideas of pope and emperor, the lords temporal and spiritual, would merge too.

What made the merger possible was the appeal to the Old Testament. Bohemia had supplanted the Church as the "New Israel." That meant the Hussite revolution would produce generals that promoted theology, i.e., someone like Zizka, a devoted supporter of the lay chalice, the prime bone of theological contention, who used each military campaign to promote the Four Articles of the Hussite faith. But it would also produce sword wielding priests like Jerome of Prague, John Zelivsky, and, most notably, Prokop the Bald. Inspired by Israelite genocide in the Old Testament, the Hussite warriors of God earned a reputation for cruelty. Heymann claims Zizka "always insisted on sparing the lives of women and children."[27] But that didn't prevent him from exercising a "holy hatred" on those whom he considered enemies of the Law of God,[28] above all, monks. During his attack on the castle of Sedlec, Zizka told six captured prisoners that if one were prepared to decapitate the others, his life would be spared. The man who volunteered was then invited to join Zizka's army.

In October 1414, Jakoubek of Stribro and other priests in Prague began celebrating the Eucharist *sub utraque specie* with the faithful. What seemed like a minor liturgical issue had deep political consequences. The Hussites' position that Christ had celebrated the Eucharist under both species at the Last Supper was met by Catholic insistence that only priests and bishops were in attendance then, and that only they had always communed *sub utraque specie* by consuming the body and blood of Christ under the appearance of both bread and wine at Mass. The Hussites' position, known as Utraquism, led them to affirm the priesthood of all believers, which they implemented at the communist settlement of Tabor by urging women to participate in the act of consecration. The priesthood of the laity was an oxymoron that would usher in revolutionary change throughout Christendom.

The Council of Constance immediately condemned the lay chalice, which had become the symbol of the Hussite reformation. That Council threatened all who partook of both species at Mass with the ban of heresy and excommunication. The Council then invited Huss to explain himself. Huss had ignored similar invitations before, but he accepted this time, despite his fears, after receiving a guarantee of safe conduct from Sigismund, King of the

Romans. He set out for the Council on October 11, 1414 under the protection of Lords Wenceslas of Duba and Henry Lacembok, as well as John of Chlum and the latter's secretary, and a representative of the University of Prague, Master John Kardinal. Huss nevertheless made out his last will and testament before he left.

Two days after arriving in Constance, Huss received the document assuring his safe conduct from the Emperor. On November 28, however, he was summoned from his lodging and, despite the protest of John of Chlum, placed under arrest. When Sigismund arrived on Christmas Eve, he lodged a protest, but by the first of the year was reconciled to ratifying whatever the council decided. Huss was then spirited off to Gottlieben castle, where he was interrogated for months about his beliefs and put under duress to recant. Antipope John XXIII, who had excommunicated Huss, was a fellow prisoner at Gottlieben, after fleeing in disguise when he realized the council intended to depose him to resolve the Great Schism. Huss told his inquisitors he had never espoused the propositions attributed to him. The inquisitors, who seemed predisposed toward his guilt, did not believe Huss's denials, nor did Sigismund. In June 1515, Huss was found guilty of espousing the heretical doctrines of John Wycliffe, including the doctrine of remanence, or denying the real presence, which he had never held. In condemning him, the council was reacting more to the movement Huss created and the dangers it posed, which continued to metastasize. Jakoubek of Stribro, taking Huss's conflation of "*regnum*" and "*ecclesia*" to its logical conclusion was now claiming that God had created the Bohemian people to lead the church out of bondage to Rome. The universal Church had gotten the administration of the chalice wrong for 1400 years; the Bohemian Church, the Holy Nation, the New Israel, the new headquarters of the true universal church would now correct it.

On June 15, 1415, the Council of Constance condemned Utraquism. Three weeks later, the council condemned Huss to the stake for espousing doctrines, "of which many are—God knows—" he claimed "falsely ascribed to me."[29] On July 6, 1415, Huss was divested of all spiritual authority. His tonsure was shaved off and replaced with a paper dunce cap bearing the figures of three demons and the words "this is a heresiarch."[30] "Oh cursed Judas," the bishop charged with carrying out the sentence said to Huss, "who breaking away from the counsels of peace, has consulted with the Jews, we commit your soul to the devil."[31] The faggots surrounding Huss were then lit; according to one account, he died singing.

The bishop's final malediction against Huss mentions accusations that dogged Huss's movement from its inception. Huss was accused of conspiring with the Jews, which discredited the movement in the eyes of the orthodox. Most of the evidence comes from Jewish sources. Rabbi Louis Israel Newman claims the Hussite revolution was "a conspiracy between Hussites, Waldensians and Jews."[32] Huss was thus stigmatized as a "Judaizer". His followers were

stigmatized as "Jews or worse than Jews,"[33] and the Hussite movement was characterized as "Judaism." The charge was based on the Hussites tendency to portray their cause in Old Testament terms, but there were other reasons. Newman claims the Hussites had "personal associations with individual Jews and Jewish communities in their country."[34] He also claims "Jewish groups participate[d] actively and publicly in the rise and spread of the [Hussite] movement."[35] According to Newman, Jewish support of heretical movements, especially when they threatened to spill over into political revolutions, "run like dark threads through the history of nearly every movement of reform in European Christendom," but they "united in a special combination in the case of the Hussite Reformation."[36] Newman sees a Jewish continuity in Europe's revolutionary movements. Newman also sees the Hussite revolt as "the second important movement to challenge the authority of the Catholic Church."[37] After "the Albigensian-Waldensian heresy in Languedoc and Lombardy had been crushed. . . the impulse to revolt was transplanted to other countries, and during the 15th century gave birth to the Bohemian Reformation."[38]

The pattern of Jews supporting Judaizers in rebellion against the Church repeated itself over the next few centuries. Before long, the trajectory was predictable. The "reformers" would urge a return to Scripture and the purity of the early Church, which would lead to a resurrection of figures from the Old Testament as models of how to use the sword to bring about heaven on earth. Vernacular editions of the Bible (often falsified and published by Jews) were crucial, leading the Bohemians to think of themselves as a "chosen race." So, too, the Puritans in England and America, who, like "Christian biblicists of every period," felt "a strong and immediate sense of identity with many figures in Jewish history."[39] Their study of the Bible prompted the Hussites to challenge the ordained priesthood and to see themselves as Israelites reincarnated with a new mission from God. Huss compared Czechs who would have nothing to do with Germans to "the Jews whom Nehemiah forbade to intermarry with foreigners."[40] Citizens of Prague whose speech was "half Bohemian, half German deserve[d] a whipping." Huss closely "sought to follow the example of the Hebrew Prophet."[41]

When word of Huss's death reached Prague, fierce indignation spread, uniting the Bohemian people against Rome and the Emperor. Hundreds of Bohemian lords affixed their seals to a document protesting the Council's action against Huss, but their protest only earned them excommunication by the same Council. The Jews of Prague joined the Christians of Bohemia in their protest. They were, of course, immune to ecclesiastical sanction, but the way in which they described Huss's death is instructive. The anonymous author of a contemporary Jewish chronicle described Huss' death as "*Kiddush hashem*" or Sanctification of the Divine Name, a term Gladstein says was "applied only to the martyrdom of Jews."[42] Gladstein cites the term as "further proof that the Jews considered the Hussites were Jews."[43] The Hussites' view

of themselves was no different. Heymann says the Hussites "did not think of themselves as innovators" or "as creators of a new form of religion and society," but rather "as restorers of the old ways of God, as the direct successors of the people of Israel" determined to create "little theocratic communities" in the mountains of Bohemia, which took their names from "Biblical mountains like Tabor and Oreb" and espoused a creed that was "stern, puritan, old-testamentarian, often fanatic in its determination to purge this world of all sins and sinners by fire and sword."[44] They were classic revolutionaries, in the mold of Simon bar Kokhba at Bethar and the Jews who committed suicide at Masadah.

Less than a year after Huss's death, Jerome of Prague followed him to Constance and suffered the same fate, burning at the stake, on May 30, 1416. Jerome did not die singing. His death was long, slow, and painful. Their deaths, as the anonymous Jewish chronicler noted, rallied the Czech people around Huss, whom they declared their saint. From 1416 on, the anniversary of Huss's death was celebrated in Prague. Huss and the chalice became "joined from then on in a mutually reinforcing union"[45] that threatened to fall apart whenever external opposition lagged. Sigismund's brutal and stupid policies, however, ensured that that would not happen soon. Galvanized by the death of Huss, his movement became increasingly messianic. In March, 1417, the Hussite faction at the University of Prague redoubled its support of the utraquist position, saying that communion under both species was necessary for salvation. They also declared the Roman rite invalid, and made the Bohemian Hussite movement the one true church of Christ on earth. The chalice, images of which would soon be sewn on the sleeves of Taborite soldiers, became the official symbol of the Bohemian revolution, which, true to the Old Testament model, was both political and religious.

Eight months after the Hussites declared spiritual independence, the Council of Constance resolved the Great Schism by electing Oddone Cardinal Colonna as Pope Martin V. The pope soon met a procession of Jews in Constance, informing them while astride a white horse with silk and gold harness, "You have the law, but understand it not."[46] The Jews, though, hadn't come to be lectured on the Christian faith or their blindness to its truth. Still smarting from the accusations of a Jewish-Hussite conspiracy, the Jews feared for their lives at the hands of Catholic crusaders, and so pleaded with the pope for protection. Graetz claimed the request was accompanied by large sums of money. What the Jews got for their money, although Graetz doesn't put it this way, was a reiteration of *Sicut Judaeis non*, the traditional teaching of the Church on the Jews. The Jews were blind, and they were a pernicious influence in Christian society, but they should not be harmed. Or as Martin V put it: "Whereas the Jews are made in the image of God and a remnant of them will one day be saved, and whereas they have besought our protection, following in the footsteps of our predecessors we command that they be not molested

in their synagogues; that their laws, rights and customs be not assailed; that they be not baptized by force, constrained to observe Christian festivals, nor to wear new badges and that they be not hindered in their business relations with Christians."[47]

Martin V was not as lenient or as understanding with the Hussites. A few months after his election in spring 1418, Martin V in conjunction with the Council, which dissolved in April, sent King Wenceslas 24 recommendations to rid Bohemia of the Hussite heretics and to repair what they vandalized and restore what they stole. On April 22, Martin appealed to Sigismund to enforce the decrees, granting him the right to organize a crusade against the heretics. Each time the Council of Constance tried to impose order by force in Bohemia, it united a people that otherwise threatened to dissolve into warring factions, unable to resolve internal theological differences without recourse to force of arms. Martin V demanded that Huss' followers publicly approve his condemnation and execution. Coupled with the economic boycott imposed on Bohemia and the threat of a crusade, Martin V's demand united the Bohemian nation behind the most radical Hussite leaders.

In spring 1419, John Zelivsky, a violent revolutionary priest, became *de facto* dictator of Prague. Zelivsky was an "apostate monk," who never missed an opportunity to attack the institution he had abandoned.[48] Zelivsky was a sword-wielding priest who aspired to be Zizka's equal as a military leader. He failed miserably as a military leader, but he was adept at agit-prop and mobilizing the mob for violence, which culminated in the defenestration that touched off the revolution. The transition from priest to revolutionary is discernable in Zelivsky's sermons, which became progressively more revolutionary and violent during 1419. Zelivsky turned Sigismund's unfortunate use of words in creating an "Order of the Dragon" into the claim that Sigismund was the Antichrist. The second coming of Christ was thus was at hand, and Prague had a special role to play. The Holy Nation of Bohemia was going to inaugurate the millennium, Christ's reign, heaven on earth. The time had come for God's holy nation to grab the sword and bring on the millennium. Intoxicated by his rhetoric, the mob in Prague began to bring on the millennium by vandalizing images, often destroying whole churches, and beating up Catholic priests or monks unfortunate enough to be caught alone on the street.

To whip the masses into a revolutionary frenzy, Zelivsky organized processions. He would lead the faithful to a church with a monstrance firmly grasped in both hands, and stand back as the mob vandalized the church under this blasphemous sanction. During the late spring and summer of 1419, as Wenceslas IV lost control of his capital city and his kingdom, the revolutionary priests staged blasphemous processions featuring bare breasted whores riding beasts symbolizing the Whore of Babylon from the book of Revelation. The rest of the whore's body was covered with scrolls representing

papal bulls and tiny bells that tinkled, in mockery of the bells rung during the consecration of the Mass. The riotous procession eventually wound its way to the New Town Square, where a fire was kindled and the bulls, stripped from the whore's body, were burnt in defiance. Festivals and processions of this sort, replete with obscenity and blasphemy, served as "visual and dramatic propaganda" that tended toward "temporal subversion of the social order." For a time, "the world was turned upside down. The lecherous whore played the virgin or pope, the fool became bishop, the criminal donned the king's crown, the ass brayed at the altar, while everyone ran leaping though the cathedral singing uproariously the drunken liturgy."[49]

Hussite songs would play an even more crucial role in the revolution. The most famous was "Ye Warriors of God." Hussite warriors could win battles just by singing "Ye Warriors of God," because its melody would throw opposing armies into panic. Even the music had an Old Testament referent. Zizka seemed a reincarnation of Joshua, and the Hussites were bringing the walls of Jericho down with their music. But the connection was in the music too, or at least in the lyrics. In "Arise, Arise Great City of Prague," the Hussites call upon God to protect them

> against that king of
> Babylon who threatens the city of
> Jerusalem, Prague, and all faithful people.

Hussite propaganda could only subvert the medieval ecclesiastical order by appealing to models from the Old Testament. If Bohemia were now Israel, then Prague was Jerusalem, and if Prague were Jerusalem, then Rome must be Babylon, and so on. This logic of analogy was essential to the revolutionary project because it was the only way the revolutionaries could legitimize their cause. "Matej of Janov," we are told, "had earlier written in his *Narracia de Milicio* that the Jerusalem experiment founded by Jan Milic of Kromeriz was the beginning of a divine action through Christ to create from Prague, formerly a city of Babylon full of filth and shame, a city of light upon a hill—Jerusalem."[50] These appeals to the Old Testament de-legitimatized a social order based on the Catholic Church and its appropriation of classical culture. The cultural agit-prop proved it possible to construe sacred realities in another compelling way.

The mass gatherings on the hills throughout summer 1419, showed that an alternative society, where there was neither lord nor servant, nor mine or thine, was possible. The Hussites named these Woodstock-like gatherings on the hills Tabor, after the mountain in Palestine where Jesus was transfigured and appeared in glory alongside Moses and Elijah. Napoleon would stand on Tabor centuries later after defeating the Ottoman Turks in a moment of apotheosis that led many Jews to proclaim him the messiah. Tabor, in turn, towered over the plains of Megiddo, where, it is said, the Antichrist would fight

his final battle. In Bohemia in 1419, Tabor symbolized the alternative to the Catholic social order, symbolized by the monasteries. Tabor was an assembly in nature, outside the city, and therefore outside of history and the sinful accretions of Roman culture. Tabor was the locus of the Transfiguration, a manifestation of glory in the here and now. In the gospel, Jesus warns his disciples not to erect structures on Tabor, a warning that stresses how fleeting glory and exaltation are in this world. The judaizing Taborite priests, however, imposed the opposite meaning. Tabor was to be the basis of a new social order. During the summer of 1419, thousands of peasants abandoned their farms and cottages, wives, and families to live according to the new dispensation, on top of a hill near Usti overlooking the Luznice river.

"Nothing," Norman Cohn says, "could show more clearly the extent to which these people lived in and from eschatological phantasies than the names which they gave to this town and to the river beneath it. While the latter became the Jordan, the former became Tabor—that is to say, the Mount of Olives [sic] where Christ had foretold his Parousia, where he had ascended to heaven and where, traditionally, he was expected to reappear in majesty. It was Tabor which became the spiritual center of the whole radical movement."[51]

The Taborite settlement in Bohemia was the locus of different movements: iconoclasm, communism—"Mine and thine do not exist at Tabor . . . whoever owns private property commits a mortal sin"[52]—Millennialism, Adventism, and, if we include the Adamites, who were eventually expelled, nudism and sexual liberation. But they were united in their revolutionary messianic politics derived from their reading of the Old Testament. "The Taborites," Newman says, "were dominated by Old Testament influence almost to the same degree as the Puritans of England and early America."[53] Like the Puritans, they "compared themselves to the ancient Israelites, regarded themselves as God's Chosen People and denounced their foes as impious Canaanites, inhabitants of Edom, Moab and Amalek, as they designated the adjacent German provinces."[54] Newman says the Taborites "rejected the entire ecclesiastical ritual system, and held invocation of saints to be heretical and idolatrous."[55] They based their iconoclasm "on Old Testament injunctions against image worship."[56] Like the Israelites, the Hussites favored an elective king. They attempted to get first the Polish King and then his Lithuanian nephew to rule them. Like Cromwell and the founders of the American republic, they based their republicanism not on classical models, but on their reading of the Book of Deuteronomy.

Tabor began not as a settlement but as a rally. To use a modern analogy, the settlement at Tabor was as if the people who attended Woodstock never left but instead created a community, which created an army, which conquered the country, and then went on military forays into Canada and Mexico, too. The success of the rally gave credence to "mass secession from the established order,"[57] which began when the peasants heard about the Millennialism of

the revolutionary priests at rallies and decided not to go home but to set up a permanent dwelling outside the existing social order. The mass rally was itself an act of revolutionary defiance in a culture where the right to "convoke a multitude" was the sole prerogative of the state. Lawrence of Brezova was dumbfounded by the novelty of large masses of people congregating on hills; he consulted astrologers for an explanation, eventually concluding Saturn had set the mob in motion and inclined their minds toward "rebelling against their superiors."[58] The uneducated peasants thought the end of the age was at hand, especially since the priests were telling them that, with citations from Daniel and Revelation to prove it.

The gatherings began during the summer of 1419 as an extension of the cultural agit-prop priests like Zelivsky were promoting in Prague. Kaminsky calls Tabor, a "conspiracy" which "had diverse heads but its tails were all tied together,"[59] meaning Zelivsky was coordinating activities that linked the revolutionaries in Prague with those in southern Bohemia. Zelivsky preached sermons about the meaning of the biblical Mt. Tabor while the revolutionaries gathered on the similarly named hill on a promontory in the Luznice River. The rhetoric of his sermons made him sound like a prophet predicting the future. When the king learned of the revolutionary activity, the pace of events increased dramatically. On July 6, 1419, the king replaced the New Town City Councilors with personally picked opponents of the Hussites, but the king had waited too long. The incessant propaganda against throne and altar had turned Prague against him.

Then Zelivsky and other revolutionary priests forced the issue. The radical wing of the Hussite movement convoked a meeting on a hill near Bechyne. On July 22, between 40,000 and 50,000 people showed up. Taborite contingents from throughout Bohemia arrived with priests marching before them holding monstrances containing the body of Christ. The local Taborites were joined by contingents from the regions around Pilsen in the west, Domazlice in the northwest, Hradec Kralove in the northeast, Moravia, and, of course, Prague. After arrival, the people attended Mass and received the Eucharist *sub utraque specie.*

Royal spies at the rally reported that a conspiracy involving Zelivsky and several other Taborite priests was afoot. Kaminsky stresses the rationality of the conspirators. They may have proclaimed the end of the world to the masses, but when it came to political action in Prague, "they were not fanatics; they were at home in the world of political realities and they knew a good deal about their king and how he acted. The most reasonable way to change his policy of reaction would be to undertake limited action, to convince him that continuing the policy would cause him more trouble than reversing it, and the most reasonable kind of action would be a coup against the hated magistrates he had just installed."[60] The spies did not know when the coup would occur. One chronicler claims the spies warned the king the Taborites planned to

attack the royal castle of Novy Hrad in September. If the king thought he had a month to prepare for the attack, he was ill served by their intelligence. The attack came eight days after the mass rally at Bechyne, where it must have been planned.

If Zelivsky attended the rally at Bechyne, he could not have planned the attack after he returned to Prague. There wasn't enough time, especially since Zelivsky also had to write a sermon to incite his congregants to violence as well. On Sunday morning July 30, 1419, Zelivsky's Church of St. Mary was crowded as usual. The congregation had been told to come bearing arms so when Zelivsky told them to raise the sword they could follow his exhortation in a literal manner. Zelivsky looked to the Old Testament to find models to justify insurrection. He began by citing Ezekiel 6: 3-5: "Behold I, even I, will bring a sword upon you, and I will destroy your high places. And your altars shall be desolate and your images shall be broken: and I will cast down your slain men before your idols. And I will lay the dead carcass of the children of Israel before their idols and I will scatter your bones round about your altars." Zelivsky's sermon was calculated to get his congregants to act on what he preached. The anonymous chronicler claims "he vigorously incited the people to sedition in the city against the town councilors and those who supported them."[61]

Concluding his sermon at around 8:30 a.m., Zelivsky picked up a monstrance and urged the congregation to follow him into the streets. The fired-up congregants marched in an illegal procession to St. Stephen's Church, forced open its doors, and held an impromptu service there. Zelivsky celebrated Mass and the congregants received communion *sub utraque specie.* After Mass, Zelivsky again picked up the monstrance; this time he led the mob to the New Town Hall, where, although it was Sunday morning, a number of city councilmen had gathered, probably to discuss what to do about Zelivsky.

Hearing the mob outside, the mayor and a number of the town magistrates, all wearing the chains that were the insignia of their office, went to the window and began an ill-advised colloquy with the mob, which demanded release of Hussite prisoners. The mayor might have been stalling for time. A troop of mounted horsemen had already been dispatched from Hradcany castle across the river to disperse the mob. However, the mob, having heard sermon after sermon about sinful men being cast down to destruction from high places, was in no mood to negotiate with the Antichrist or his minions. The confrontation grew more heated until someone claimed a magistrate threw a stone at Zelivsky, who was standing off to the side holding the monstrance containing the sacred species. The mob then rushed the door to the New Hall, broke the bolts holding it shut, and swarmed upstairs, where they murdered some of the councilmen on the spot and threw the others out of the window, thereby giving the first successful revolution of its kind on European soil its name, i.e, the First Defenestration of Prague (the second took place at the

outbreak of the Thirty Years War). Those who survived the fall were set upon by the mob outside the hall and slain. The golden chains of office were left on their bodies, as if to indicate the symbols of office had lost their legitimacy.

During the carnage, Zelivsky stood by holding up his monstrance and urging the mob not to be reticent about shedding the blood of the Antichrist and his minions. The anonymous chronicler says, while the slaughter was going on, "the priest called John . . . bearing the body of Christ. . . continued to incite the people."[62] He also says "John Zizka, King Wenceslas' most personal attendant, was present at the slaying of the councilors."[63] This probably explains the coup's stunning success. Not only were the councilmen overpowered in their own bastion, the troop of horses sent to rescue them was also turned back, and the hall was quickly turned into a garrison by the Hussites. The chronicler adverts to Zizka's treachery too. As a personal attendant to the king, he broke a personal oath of allegiance when he engaged in the insurrection, a fact generally brought up only by Catholic commentators. Heymann mentions Zizka's solemn oath and compares him in his impiety to George Washington,[64] although not the way whiggish historians usually do, as an example of treason justified only by saying that the end justifies the means. The revolution, when it is successful, justifies the oathbreaking impiety of those who would otherwise be condemned. Even Lawrence of Brezova, the moderate Hussite who knew that Zizka committed an act of grave disobedience toward the king in whose service he was bound, characterizes Zizka as an extraordinary defender of the law of Christ.[65]

The successful attack on New Hall indicates Zizka was privy to the planning of the operation. This was not a haphazard *ad hoc* outburst of pent up emotion that would spend itself in looting and then burn itself out as quickly as it had sprung up. The Hussites installed their own government and neutralized political opposition. The defenestration meant the revolution had reached "the absolute point of no return."[66] The revolutionary regime had been established, and now it would serve, as all true revolutions claim to do, as a model for the rest of the world. On August 13, Zelivsky preached an exultant sermon claiming that Prague "now, at this time" was "the model for all the faithful—not only in Moravia, but in Hungary, Poland and Austria."[67]

Three days later, King Wenceslas suffered a second stroke more severe than his first, which happened when word of the insurrection reached him, and he died the same night "roaring like a lion" in pain, as Lawrence of Brezova put it.[68] There was now no king to oppose the revolution; a town council installed by the revolution claimed to be the rightful government of Prague. Heymann comments "important inhibitions to open revolutionary action disappeared."[69] The king died without an heir, complicating matters. The legitimate claimant to the throne was now Sigismund, who had allowed the Council of Constance to burn John Huss and Jerome of Prague at the stake.

A day after the king's death, the looting of the monasteries began. The first to go was the great charterhouse of the Carthusians at Smichov. The monasteries' wealth made them an object of envy for the entire social spectrum in Bohemia from nobles to peasants. Hatred of the monasteries united priests like Zelivsky and soldiers like Zizka. The German heritage of many monks fueled the Czech nationalism inherent in the Hussite rebellion as well. One of the great monuments to medieval culture went up in flames.

The Jews were unmolested in the looting, even though they were usually the first victims of the mob in medieval towns. Heymann considers this "a remarkable fact, especially if one considers the religious fervor underlying the movement and remembers that the Jews were often considered the servants of anti-Christ."[70] The Jews were unmolested because of what they shared with the revolutionaries, namely, "their ways of life," which Heymann claims were "just as austere and puritan as those followed by the adherents of the new creed."[71]

The Taborite gatherings continued after the defenestration. On September 17, a large gathering of Hussites assembled near Pilsen. Less than two weeks later an equally large assembly took place at Na Krizkach (At the Crosses) near Benesov, not far from Prague. Zelivsky must have been busy in Prague during the rally at Na Krizkach because the star of the show there was Wenceslas Koranda. But personality was irrelevant. All Taborite priests thought of themselves as Old Testament warriors. "Brethren," Koranda told the mob at Na Krizkach, "the time has come to lay down the staff of the pilgrim and take up the sword."[72] It was at Na Krizkach that Koranda first met Zizka.

Fired up by Koranda's sermons, the Taborites moved from Na Kriskach to Prague, arriving there after dark, where they were met by John Zelivsky at the head of a torch-bearing mob. The Church bells rang in their honor; the following day the mob broke into local churches and defaced crucifixes and other works of sacred art. The radical Taborite clergy rapidly consolidated power in Prague under Zelivsky's leadership. In their manifestos, which began showing up in university towns across Europe from Leipzig to Cambridge, the Hussites denounced the pope as the Antichrist and his clergy as "the priests of Pharaoh" and "followers of Satan."[73] True to the judaizing paradigm, they called themselves "faithful fighters of God" and compared themselves to the Maccabees.[74]

But an anti-Hussite reaction was building, one which satirized their reliance on Old Testament models to subvert the social order. "When," the anti-Hussites wrote, "our Moses—Zizka, the executioner—talks to God. . . [then the Hussites] will strike their clubs against the rock. . . water will come forth from the rock. And when you cross the Danube on dry ground like the Israelites at Jordan. . .when this happens all the land beyond the Danube will belong to you."[75] Something like the satire actually happened when Hussite armies invaded German lands to the north of Bohemia. Under the leadership

of the warrior priest Prokop the Bold, Hussite armies would march undefeated all the way to the Baltic.

By late October hundreds of Taborite revolutionaries had streamed into Prague from the provinces. The first pitched military battle of the Hussite rebellion occurred when Taborites on their way to Prague ran into royalist troops near Zivohost and suffered heavy losses. Fighting soon broke out in Prague, too. On October 25, Zizka stormed Vysehrad, the royalist castle on the Old Town side of the Vltava, successfully wresting it from royalist troops. Now the city was open to Taborite movement from the south, even if movement from the west was still cut off by Hradcany castle.

When news of the defeat of the Taborites at Zivohost reached Prague, a group of radical priests under Ambrose of Hradec Kralove attacked the royalist positions across the river. After initial success, including forcing Queen Sophie to flee from Hradcany, they were unable to prevail, leaving Hradcany in the hands of the royalists.

During the winter of 1419-1420, millennialist fever increasingly took over the Hussite movement. "During this time," Lawrence of Brezova wrote, "certain Taborite priests were preaching to the people a new coming of Christ in which all evil men and enemies of the truth would perish and be exterminated, while the good would be preserved in five cities."[76] Lawrence of Brezova was not unsympathetic to the revolutionaries, yet he concluded the devil took over the movement that winter, leading many Taborite priests "to reject the doctrines of the Church Fathers and of the Church tradition and to interpret Scripture on their own. According to the new Taborite hermeneutic, everything necessary to the salvation of man here on earth is sufficiently expressed in the New Testament; however, any interpretation necessary to understand the New Testament can be drawn from the Old for the two Laws expound each other."[77] That hermeneutic would lead inexorably to the preeminence of the Old Testament over the New, and that would affect the Taborite priests, who let their hair grow long and grew beards so they would resemble more closely the priests of the Old Testament. "The priests of the Taborites," Lawrence tells us,

> fleeing human traditions, walked about with beards and unshaven heads, in gray clothing. They did not read the canonical hours, and, without chasubles, corporals, or special chalices, they performed divine rites under the heavens or in houses, not on a holy altar, but on any sort of table covered with a linen cloth. Nor did they observe the rite of the mass by saying the collects with the canon; but all at once the priests would kneel with the brethren, place their heads on the ground . . . and pray the Lord's Prayer; then the one who was to make the sacrament of the altar got up and said in a loud and intelligible voice, in the vernacular, no more than the words of consecration over the hosts and the wine.[78]

John Pribram also noticed a change in the movement that winter. Priests like Wenceslas Koranda were changed by the Old Testament rhetoric of their own sermons into "seducers" who

> began to preach enormous cruelty, unheard-of violence and injustice to man. They said that now was the time of vengeance, the time of destruction of all sinners and the time of God's wrath . . . in which all the evil and sinful ones were to perish by sudden death, on one day . . . those cruel beasts, the Taborite priests, wanting to excite and work up the people so that they would not shrink from these afflictions, preached that it was no longer the time of mercy but the time of vengeance, so that the people should strike and kill all sinners. . . . And they called us and others who admonished them to be merciful, damaging hypocrites.[77]

The rhetoric of the revolution was drawn from historical events described in the Old Testament, but the revolution had its own inner logic, its own formal causality, that would be repeated in subsequent revolutions. Plato had described it as *metabolia*, a "quasi-natural transformation of one form of government into another" as Hannah Arendt described the devolution from democracy to tyranny.[80] Kaminsky says "the new communities formed in the winter of 1419-1420 were not stable societies, they were essentially mass movements, with a character determined by the . . . realities of the movement itself."[81]

In 1418, "Pikarti," probably Beghards or Beguines living in the area now called Belgium, migrated en masse to Prague after hearing of the revolutionary upheaval there. The Waldensians were already there; soon, according to Graetz, Jews expelled from Austria for collaborating with the Hussites joined them. All of these groups contributed ideas to the revolution, which took on a life of its own during the winter of 1419-1420.

Adventism was part of that life. In "The Story of the Priests of Tabor," John Pribram names 26 Taborite priests who "preached that Judgment Day would come in 1420."[82] As more peasants streamed into the city, preachers upped the ante, until finally they named the day, proclaiming that the Second Coming would occur between February 10 and 14, 1420. Citing Revelation 18:2, the radical preachers predicted the entire old order would perish. Their claims split the Hussite movement. The split widened when the world did not end on schedule. Jakoubek of Stribro argued against the Adventists that "even the worst calamities did not annul the sure path to salvation taught by Jesus, the path of virtuous and humble suffering."[83] But the appeal of Millennialism, Adventism, and the whole judaizing tendency toward messianic politics and heaven on earth through the sword lay precisely in its rejection of humble suffering. The Hussite conservatives found themselves swept up in a movement that was no longer Christian in any identifiable sense. Hussitism had become a Jewish revolutionary movement. The revolution was a parasite inside the

[illegible] affected the movement, then it weakened it, and then it [illegible] and turned it into the vehicle for revolution. Jakoubek realized that withdrawal from society happening all around him was not only unprecedented; it was also profoundly subversive:

> the peasant who gave up his land, burnt his house and in some cases left [illegible] in order to flee to "the mountains," was behaving in a way for which there was no precedent. And when that peasant claimed the right to wield arms, his *behavior was more than anomalous, it was revolutionary.*[86]

"Did you not formerly preach against killing," Jakoubek asks Master John of Jicin and by extension all of Tabor's revolutionary priests, "how then has everything come to be turned into its opposite?"[87] By the "opposite" Jakoubek was referring to the revolutionary messianic politics preached by the Taborite priests urging the use of "carnal and secular arms against the enemy."[88] This led to "the danger of homicide and bloodshed" as "hatreds are thereby generated which bring about a falling away from charity and a neglect of spiritual arms."[89] Jakoubek felt the priests of Tabor "should persuade people to fight an evangelical battle in God's cause, according to the evangelical and Catholic sense, with spiritual arms on the model of the Primitive Church of Christ's apostles."[90] Instead, the preaching and "perilous interpretations of scripture," of the Taborite priests were leading the people to take up "carnal military arms, abandoning the customary labor of their hands and living in idleness from the plundering of their neighbors' substance; they kill and shed blood."[91]

Nowhere was the change in the Hussite revolution more drastic than in the area of "carnal arms." Newman and others felt the Waldensian heretics had prepared the way for the Hussites, especially in southern Bohemia where their influence had always been strong. But the Waldensians were pacifists. The revolution turned on the Waldensians, by rejecting pacifism in favor of Israelite holy war. In summer, 1420, Peter Chelcicky tried to explain the trajectory in *On Spiritual Battle*, according to which the devil took over the Hussite movement during the winter of 1419-20 and turned it into a revolutionary movement based on Old Testament models. "The Devil," says Chelcicky,

> came to them clothed in other garb, *in the prophets and the Old Testament,* and from these they sought to confect an imminent Day of Judgment, saying that they were angels who had to eliminate all scandals from Christ's Kingdom, and that they were to judge the world. And so they committed many killings and impoverished many people, but they did not judge the world according to their works for the predicted time has elapsed with which they terrified the people, telling them strange things which they collected from many prophets.[92]

"At some point during the winter of 1419-1420, the congregations degenerated morally to the point *where their reaction to persecution in the winter of 1419-20, was not the Christian suffering of the New Testament but the self conscious violence of the Old.*"[92] The assessment is Kaminsky's, but he is clearly following Chelcicky's lead. Chelcicky portrayed the conflict as between the old law and the new:

> If power were supposed to be administered through Christ's faith by means of battles and punishments, and try to benefit Christ's faith thereby, then why would Christ have abolished the Jewish Law and established a different spiritual one? If he had wanted people to cut each other up, to hang, drown and burn each other, and otherwise pour out human blood for his Law, then that Old Law could also have stood unchanged with the same bloody deeds as before.[93]

The turn toward revolution during that winter bespoke a reversion to the vomit of Judaism and a rejection of the Cross, the symbol under which civilization had grown for a millennium in Europe. The uprooting of thousands of peasants by the preaching of the Judaizers increased the pressure to pursue the revolutionary course. Since the uprooted peasants were no longer tilling their fields, they had to pillage their non-Adventist, non-revolutionary neighbors to survive. They had to destroy to live; the revolutionary creed rationalized their violence and gave them incentive to pursue it to its bloody conclusion. Adventism, the idea that the current order was going to be destroyed, flowed inexorably from the premises of millennialism. As we have seen, from Adventism, it was only a short step to messianic politics, which decreed that the new heaven and new earth could be brought about by the sword. Theological doctrines ratified the revolutionary situation. When the peasants left their farms and moved to Tabor, they had to pillage and destroy in order to survive. That is how the revolutionary engine got created.

By 1429, the high point of Hussite incursion into neighboring countries, Peter Payne-Englis, an English Wycliffite who joined the Bohemian revolution in 1419 and followed both Zizka and Prokop into battle, would proclaim to Sigismund that "Our Lord Jesus Christ is a most invincible soldier and Prague warrior."[93] Hussites like Jakoubek and Christian of Prachatice thought the idea preposterous, so the controversy split the Hussite movement between the "conservatives" of Prague and the "radicals" of Tabor. The split between Prague and Tabor presaged a similar split in the French and the Russian revolutions. One wing wanted to reform society (or the church); the other wanted to abolish society. The same split would take place in the Taborite movement too, when the Adamites were expelled. In the winter of 1419-20, the Judaizers took over the movement and turned it into a revolution. By spring, the new movement had "nothing in common with even the most radical variety of official Hussite scholasticism" and a civil war between Prague and Tabor was inevitable.[94] By

spring, the Hussite movement centered in Prague was committed to reform, while the branch in Tabor was committed to revolution.

In March 1420, John Zizka, recognizing he could not conquer Pilsen in western Bohemia against superior royalist forces, agreed to lift his siege and withdraw but only under certain conditions. Zizka had become a devoted defender of the Four Articles, the essence of the Hussite creed. As one condition of his withdrawal, he demanded Hussites in Pilsen be allowed to communicate under both species. As another, he asked for passage under safe conduct for about 400 of the most radical Hussites to Tabor, the hill-top redoubt a few days to the southeast. Zizka set out with 400 armed men and 12 gun-carrying wagons on March 22 or 23. On March 25, they crossed the Otava River at a ford near the village of Sudomer. There they encountered two columns of royalist troops, around 2000 men, most of whom were mounted and in heavy armor. According to conventional military standards, Zizka and his men were hopelessly outnumbered and doomed to defeat. But Zizka was a military genius who was not bound by the conventions of war. His only chance lay in quickly finding terrain disadvantageous to a cavalry charge. There were no hills in the vicinity, but Zizka found an embankment which served as a dam for a fishpond. Using the dam to cover one of his flanks and the war wagons to cover the other, he concentrated his troops on a very small front, negating the superior numbers of his foe. When the first waves of cavalry failed to dislodge the Hussites, the cavalry dismounted and tried to defeat them in hand-to-hand combat. They nearly broke through the line of wagons but were eventually beaten back. Finally it grew dark and the attackers, whose position was neither so compact nor so organized as the defenders' position, called off the attack and retreated. To commentators, there seemed something miraculous about Zizka's defeat of a superior force. One quotes royalist soldiers: "My pike does not pierce, my sword does not cut and my crossbow does not shoot."[95] The Battle of Sudomer was the beginning of the Zizka legend. In the eyes of many Hussite warriors, God had intervened and saved them from a superior foe.

Zizka's "army" was made up of peasants, who neither had arms nor knew how to wield them effectively. Using the sword and riding a horse, or doing both simultaneously, required skill, which peasants had neither time nor opportunity to learn. In two months in 1420, before he was summoned to defend Prague, Zizka took men armed with pitchforks and flails used to separate wheat from chaff, and turned them into an army that would become invincible, defeating over the next decade the most powerful armies the pope and emperor could send against them. No less an authority than Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini, later Pius II, said Zizka had been sent by God to punish the Church for its sins. Piccolomini was no fan of Zizka: at another point, he said, in Bohemia a blind people followed a blind leader. But Zizka was undeniably one of the great military geniuses of European history. Zizka could

be compared to Napoleon, but the man Zizka most closely resembled was Oliver Cromwell, another military genius moved by an equally revolutionary form of Old Testament-inspired messianic politics.

Zizka was also a tactical genius. Even when he was totally blind, he could deploy his troops based on his memory of the terrain and the reports he got from his subordinates. His tactical judgment was invariably correct, and it saved his troops repeatedly from hopeless situations. But Zizka was also a genius at using what was available and developing it in ways no one had thought of before. It was pointless to use the peasant flail against a cavalry charge; but once that charge was neutralized by hill, trenches, and encircled wagons armed with mortars, forcing the knights to dismount, then those flails, studded with iron spikes, suddenly became formidable weapons.

Zizka understood medieval warfare was largely individual combat. Battles were melees of individuals fighting other individuals. Once the battle was engaged, only those along the front did the actual fighting. So if Zizka could reduce the effective size of the front with hills, trenches, battlewagons, and embankments, as at Sudomer, he could reduce the numerical advantage of his foe. Zizka's greatest innovation was his use of the war wagon as a mobile fortress, a tactic American pioneers would later use against the plains Indians. The Boers would use the same innovation still later in South Africa. But Zizka's wagons were not simply portable walls; they had heavy boards on them as rudimentary armor, and guns, which were very effective at short range in stopping a cavalry charge.

Zizka created a very effective division of labor. He did not train the inexperienced peasants to engage in individual combat with the knights. Instead, teams of peasants were assigned to perform specific tasks on the war wagons, which were armed with two or three hand pieces, a large number of crossbows, and heavier guns on gun carriages. At the battle of Kutna Hora, Zizka used wagons as offensive weapons—as 15th century tanks—for the first time in the history of warfare, to break out of an encirclement that would have doomed any other field commander. "The Taborite army, in the way Zizka formed it, acquired a degree of national subdivision, tactical organization and actual battle cooperation far beyond anything used before in medieval warfare."[96] Zizka did all this in less than two months, between March 27, 1420, when he arrived at Tabor, and May 18, when he left to save Prague from Sigismund's army.

Many were drawn to Tabor by the Adventism and chiliasm of the priests, who predicted the world, except for the five Bohemian places of refuge, would be destroyed. Once the date came and went without noticeable change, prophecy was replaced by will. The new world would now be brought into existence by destroying the old. Communism also made its first appearance at Tabor. Adventism may have failed, but the millennial spirit was still strong. Communism flowed from Millennialism—the time when the wolf would lie

down with the lamb—and the exigencies of the revolutionary situation. Tabor was an armed camp with autonomous military units which would issue forth from the hill-top redoubt and attack local villages. Often, those villages would be burnt to the ground, and their inhabitants would then migrate to Tabor, where they too became infected with the millennialist virus. Once at Tabor, the refugees learned that, as the Millennium was about to dawn in Bohemia, "men would no longer be like wolves to one another; they would be as brothers and sisters."[97] At Tabor the Gospel was going to be implemented as in the early Church. So, "following the commands of Holy Scripture, it was enacted that no one was to own anything; private property was to be abolished and everything to be common property as in the days of the apostles."[98] Wooden tubs were set up in the town square in front of the community church, so the faithful could place all their worldly goods in them. The revolutionary priests appointed "clerks of the tubs" for "giving to everyone according to his needs."[99] Private property was to be abolished "not only in Bohemia but all over the world."[100] Private property was associated with Babylon, the city from which the Taborites had fled in horror. Since Tabor was the antithesis of Babylon, property was considered sinful. At Tabor, "everything should always be in common for all, and no one may have anything privately; if he does, he sins mortally."[101]The elect were assembled, uncontaminated by the corrupt Roman system, and from this ethnic enclave, the holy Bohemian nation would spread the Gospel to all mankind.

Communism flowed logically from the failure of Adventism, by making the kingdom of the New Israel a matter of will. But it flowed just as obviously from a millennialist reading of the scriptures and the exigencies of the situation. Thousands of uprooted peasants poured into Tabor weekly, and all of them had to be fed. Communism satisfied theological and practical needs. Modern Communists saw Tabor as the forerunner of Marxism, but their commitment to materialism blinded them to the religious dimensions at Tabor, for communism at Tabor was based on a reading of the Acts of the Apostles [2:42-47; 4:32-5:11]. Czech communist Josef Macek claimed "the new revolutionary fortress Tabor" was "the first time in world history that a rebellious people, dreaming of a classless society, started to work and build a new town in which from the beginning decisive power lay in the hands of the common people."[102] Macek's materialism blinded him to Tabor's revolutionary Jewish antecedents as much as it blinded him to the influence of the Acts of the Apostles. Tabor may have been the first "new revolutionary fortress" on European soil, but this hill-top redoubt bore a striking resemblance to Masada and Bethar, where the Jewish revolutionaries took their stands against another Rome.

Like Simon bar Kokhba and his followers, the Taborites were a "holy nation" of ethnic nationalists who strove to drive "Romans" from their land. The leaders of both revolutions saw themselves as following in the footsteps

of figures from the Old Testament—Moses, Joshua, Gideon, David. Both revolutions defeated the Romans initially and established a "golden age" and a "paradise on earth" by recourse to the sword. Their enemies saw them as rejecters of Christ or, more specifically, rejecters of the Cross of Christ and the political consequences which the Cross entailed. Both movements created a state religion and expelled those who would not swear allegiance to the military messiah who was to lead the "holy nation" in battle. Both revolutions were to serve as an alternative to the Roman model for all mankind, and both felt that they were inaugurating a new era of history, a concept which reached its fulfillment in the French Revolution, which denominated 1792 as the year One.

Macek and, to some extent, Cohn, fail to see how these revolutionary branches are connected to theological roots. For example, the Taborites denied the existence of purgatory. "They say that there will be no more purgative fire because when a man is poor that is his purgatory."[103] There is no purging fire in the next life because "when people live in poverty, that can be seen as their purifying fire." If the Taborite theologians could declare purgatory was on earth, why couldn't they say the same about heaven? This in fact is exactly what they did, claiming

> only God's elect were to remain on the earth—those who had fled to the mountains. And they said that the elect of God would rule in the world for a thousand years with Christ, visibly and tangibly. And they preached that the elect of God who fled to the mountains would themselves possess all the goods of the destroyed evil ones and rule freely over all their estates and villages. And they say, "you will have such an abundance of everything that silver, gold, and money will only be a nuisance to you."[104]

The failed predictions of February 1420 didn't change matters. They simply substituted for God the human will as the agency which would bring about heaven on earth. To bring about heaven on earth, the Taborites had to eradicate sin. The eradication of sin became the rationale for revolutionary violence derived directly from the Old Testament. Taboritism was an extreme form of Zionism, with the Bohemian people in the role of the new Israelites. "Every place that your foot strikes," the Taborite priests told the uprooted masses in Tabor to usher in the millennium, "is yours and will remain yours."[105] The passage is from Deuteronomy 11:24, which indicates once again that the Taborites were the new Israel, "an army sent by God through the whole world to remove all scandals from the kingdom of Christ, which is the Church Militant, and to expel the evil ones from the midst of the just, and to take vengeance and visit affliction on the nations of the enemies of the Law of Christ and against their cities, villages and fortified places."[106]

The Taborite priest John Capek, who wrote sermons "more full of blood than a fish pond is of water," went out of his way to incite the mob to

bloodshed. Capek developed the idea of the time of vengeance. He specified the kinds of violence to be done to the enemy "according to the will of the Holy Spirit" and insisted on absolute, universal killing and destruction outside the congregations of the elect: all sinners were to be killed, all buildings were to be destroyed, every last physical entity of the old world had to be wiped from existence. Since the only way to destroy nonmaterial institutions was to kill the people in them, "all people in high ranks were to be brought down, chopped down like pieces of wood." The violence was religious, orgiastic, ritualistic, and practical; its purpose was to purge the world in preparation for the "consummation of the age," and its sanction lay in the new situation created by Christ's secret coming, which had annihilated all traditional guides to behavior.[107]

The Millennium would usher in not the fulfillment of Christianity but its abolition. The Taborite priests talked of how the Elect will rule the earth. "All kings, princes and prelates of the church will cease to be,"[108] which is logical if God's soldiers have abolished sin on earth. Without sin, there would be no need of princes to wield the sword in earthly rule. The irony was that the revolutionary priests were going to bring this about by wielding the sword themselves, but ironies were lost on them:

> "The Elect . . . will be brought back to the state of innocence of Adam in Paradise, like Enoch and Elijah, and they would be without any hunger or thirst, or any other spiritual or physical pain. And in holy marriage and with immaculate marriage-bed they will carnally generate sons and grandchildren here on earth and on the mountains, without pain or trouble and without any original sin. Then there will be no need for baptism by water because they will be baptized in the Holy Spirit, nor will there be the tangible sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, because they will be fed in a new angelic mode—not in the memory of Christ's passion, but of his victory. . . . In this renovated kingdom there well be no sin, no scandal, no abomination, no falsehood, but all will be the chosen sons of god, and all the suffering of Christ and of his lambs will cease . . . Women will give birth to their children without pain and without original sin . . . and children born in the kingdom, if they are of the kingdom, will never die, because death will no longer be.[109]

The references to women giving birth without pain gave the conservative wing of the Hussite movement pause. "If women give birth without pain," John Pribram wrote in *Contra Articulos Picardorum*, taking their thought to its logical conclusion, "then also without sin, for all pain is from sin; thus original sin will cease and so will baptism, and, consequently Christianity."[110] The new system—"a peculiar system of interpreting the New Law by the Old, and vice versa, so as to generate a third body of wisdom"—was not Christian. It was

decidedly anti-Christian. Martin Huska and other Taborite priests learned this system from "Wenceslas, the tavern keeper in Prague."[111]

And why not? Prague had already become a magnet for heretics and Jews from all over Europe. In 1418, according to Lawrence of Brezova, a group of forty "Pikarti," with their wives and children, came to Prague saying they had been expelled by their prelates 'because of the Law of God," and "they had heard that Bohemia offered the greatest freedom for the evangelical truth."[112] By spring, 1420, the revolutionaries had taken over Tabor. Under the leadership of Martin Huska, who was eventually expelled and then hunted down and martyred for his beliefs, the Taborites morphed into the Adamites, who decided they could bring about heaven on earth by shedding their clothes and engaging in indiscriminate sexual activity, when they were not pillaging neighboring villages and murdering anyone who opposed them. Adamitism took the idea "man can attain the same perfection of beatitude in the present as he will obtain in the blessed life to come"[113] to its logical conclusion, at least according to the logic of carnal minds. Heaven on earth became a function of pure will, disconnected from reason. Zizka would deal with the Adamites militarily, but it's hard to see how he could argue with their premises. To have heaven on earth, we must first have total war; that premise stretched from Simon bar Kokhba to Trotsky and the Neoconservatives. It had nothing to do with Waldensian pacifism. That premise provided the justification for each of the Taborite sects, even when fighting among themselves over how to bring heaven on earth into being.

Fortunately for the Hussites, Sigismund would unite them in spite of themselves and their theological differences. The conservative Hussite wing in Prague was always trying to find a *modus vivendi* with the King of the Romans, and Sigismund, through his brutality and blundering, constantly drove them back into the arms of the Taborite radicals. When Zizka was working out details of the evacuation of Pilsen, John Krasa, a Prague merchant, foolishly espoused the cause of the chalice while on a business trip to Breslau, later Wroclaw, one of Sigismund's strongholds. Krasa was accused of heresy, refused to recant, and was burned at the stake in the public square. Two days after Krasa's death, a bull announcing a crusade against the Wycliffites, the Hussites, and other heretics was proclaimed in Wroclaw. Sigismund's treatment of Krasa awakened memories of how the Council of Constance had dealt with Huss and Jerome of Prague. His treatment of Krasa drove the conservative Hussites into the arms of the Taborite radicals just when the conservatives were coming to see how radical their agenda was and how incompatible it was with Christian tradition. The crusading army was to be convened in a German city and made up of troops largely from German-speaking lands; all Czechs, not just the radical Taborites, must have viewed it with horror. The bull was aimed at all Czechs, and as its first consequence, it forced them to overcome their differences. Sigismund evidently was not

conversant with the tactic of divide and conquer. He could have granted liturgical concessions to the Prague conservatives and then proceeded militarily against the revolutionaries, but his mind did not make subtle distinctions. Instead, he vowed to proceed against "all of those who took communion in the two kinds," thereby uniting the Czech nation against him.

His policy also drove the uncommitted and those who had expressed reservation about the Taborite agenda into the hands of the radicals. Once reconciliation was ruled out, those who had no other place to go swelled the ranks of the radicals. About the time of Krasa's execution, John Zelivsky, the man who orchestrated the defenestration, emerged as the *de facto* ruler of Prague. Zelivsky had identified Sigismund with the Red Dragon of Revelation, and Sigismund's actions appeared to prove that Zelivsky was a prophet.

Soon a common spirit of solidarity and defiance united Prague. On April 3, Zelivsky convoked a meeting at the city hall of the Old Town in Prague; everyone in attendance swore a solemn oath to defend their religion and their country. Five days later, Praguers began digging a moat between the city and the royalist fortress of Vysehrad south of town. The whole town mobilized for digging the trench, including—and this is the first time the Hussites are mentioned in open alliance with them—the Jews. On April 8, 1420, the Jews worked side by side with the Hussites in digging the trench opposite Vysehrad Castle, and both sang hymns composed by Rabbi Avigdor ben Isaac Kara as they worked. Open ecumenical collaboration of this sort was unprecedented. Another version of the same story explains the communal singing not as an expression of solidarity but as a Jewish attempt to proselytize Hussites. Ruth Gladstein claims the Jews sang Kara's songs in Yiddish hoping that the Czechs, who were already familiar with German, might understand the lyrics and convert to Judaism.[114] "Jew, Christian, Arab! Understand!" they sang, "God has no form that can be seen." The Jews were emboldened because they felt the Hussites were on their way to becoming Jews anyway and needed only a subtle nudge to take the final step.

The Catholics quickly used this collaboration to discredit the Hussites. The Catholics had always claimed that the Hussites were involved in a conspiracy with the Jews. Now they had proof. Gladstein says "the Jews of Bavaria were accused of the same crime," i.e, of collaborating with the Hussites.[115] As a result, the crusading armies attacked them as well. In discussing "the alleged collaboration of Jews with Hussites and the so-called judaizing elements in Hussitism," Gladstein cites Rabbi Newman, who claims Huss was on friendly terms with Jewish teachers in Prague, that the Vienna Theological Faculty accused the Hussites of collaborating with the Jews, and that Jews of Bavaria secretly supplied the Hussites with money and arms.[116] Any attempts to portray the Jews as neutrals are dismissed out of hand by Newman as "not. . . likely."[117] St. John of Capistrano, in Wroclaw at the end of the 15th century, leveled the same accusation: the Hussites had joined with the Jews in a war against

the pope and Christendom, a contention Newman supports. Newman also says the Jews influenced the Adamites. Jewish influence pervaded the Hussite movement, according to Newman. "From its inception," virtually the entire spectrum of the Hussite movement "bore marks of Jewish, and particularly Old Testament influences."[118] Graetz says the same thing: "Catholics accused Jews of secretly supplying the Hussites with money and arms; and in the Bavarian towns near the Boehmerwald, they persecuted them unmercifully as friends and allies of the heretics. The Dominicans. . . included the Jews in their fiery pulpit denunciations of the Hussites."[119]

By May, 1420, as the imperial crusade marched from Wroclaw to Prague, the Jewish/Hussite collaboration had become intolerable to Catholic princes. Reacting to accusations of such collaboration, Albert, Archduke of Austria, ordered all the Jews in his realm thrown into prison on May 23. In March, 1421, Albert had some Jews burned at the stake and the rest expelled from Austria. Conversion was also an option, but, as Graetz says, "the converts proved no gain to the church. The majority seized the first opportunity of emigrating and relapsing into Judaism."[120] Those who converted to save their skins then "bent their steps to Bohemia, rendered tolerant by the Hussite schism," swelling the revolutionary movement there.[121] This came as no surprise. The Church had been alleging a Jewish/Hussite conspiracy ever since Huss had been burned at the stake. Catholic crusaders were reported as attacking Jews, "and only them," as they marched to Bohemia in 1419 as part of the anti-Hussite crusade. The attacks were so violent that "the Maharil, the leader of Central European Jewry, found it necessary to order all Jews, men and women alike, to observe a severe and long fast."[122] The illustrious rabbi of Mainz, Jacob ben Moses Moelin Halevi, known as the Maharil, renewed his call for fasting and prayer that victory might be granted to the Hussite armies in September 1421, when Zizka faced the imperial army at Saatz. Apparently God granted their prayers; Zizka triumphed, and the crusaders who threatened to wipe the Jewish people from the earth instead begged for bread at their doors.

Gladstein claims the Jews were deeply impressed by "a drastic change in the Hussites' religious behavior,"[123] implicitly corroborating the charge levelled by the Catholics that the Jews supported the insurrection. Rabbi Avigdor Kara, who grew up in Prague and authored the hymns the Jews sang with the Hussites in the trenches outside Vysehrad, felt the Hussites were on the verge of becoming Jews. It was not an idea to be taken lightly, because any Jew who held these views risked his life, but the Jews too were caught up in the millennialist fever. The idea that the Hussites were becoming Jews was so fraught with danger, that "no Jew would have imagined such a thing as the conversion of the Hussites, let alone written about it, unless he thought that the exile was ending and the footsteps of the messiah would soon be heard. So we can assume that Avigdor Kara believed that the days of the messiah were imminent."[124]

The Jews felt the Hussites were ripe for conversion because, according to Jewish sources, King Wenceslas and John Huss had converted secretly to Judaism under Rabbi Avigdor Kara himself. According to the anonymous Jewish chronicler, King Wenceslas liked Kara and spoke with him often. Kara exploited this by subverting the King's faith, wearing him down "until the King acknowledged that that man's [in Hebrew writing "that man" refers to Jesus Christ] faith was false. After the King's death, there appeared a priest called Huss 'who attracted all the townsfolk and taught them the true unity—Israel's faith.'"[125]

King Wenceslas died four years after Huss, not before Huss as the chronicler alleges. So the anonymous Jewish chronicler's claim may be a fantasy based on *a priori* assumptions, most notably the fact that Jews didn't think that the *goyim* were intelligent enough to come up with the judaizing Hussite creed on their own. Gladstein says precisely that but rescues the credibility of the anonymous Jewish chronicler by claiming that while he was inaccurate with particular dates, he did describe "two stages in the rise of the movement: 1) the King renounces his belief in Jesus: 2) Huss teaches the essential principles of Judaism to the people of Prague and they destroy images, burn statues and kill priests. After that it says: 'and most of the people in that country (Bohemia) set themselves to dissolve that man's faith.'"[126] The Viennese Hebrew MS describes the burning of Huss at the stake as "*Kiddush hashem*" or "Sanctification of the Divine name," constituting "further proof that the Jews considered the Hussites Jews; for the expression 'sanctification of the divine name' is applied only to the martyrdom of Jews."[127] In the same manuscript, Catholic countries are referred as "Edom." This epithet is traditionally applied to enemies of the Jews, but here it denotes enemies of the Hussites, another indication the Jews considered the Hussites, if not one of their own, then at least on the way. In an era of messianic expectation for the Jews and millennialist and Adventist expectation for the Hussites, the two groups were clearly linked in what was about to happen. When the Hussites threatened to burn Nuremberg to the ground, the German natives imposed a tax on the Jews to buy off the Czech invaders. The Jewish commentator claims "When the Hussites had no leader, they dropped their ideas and most of them relapsed. [But] on one mountain called Tabor, there are still Hussites who do not believe in 'that man.'"[128]

The full extent of the collaboration between the Hussites and the Jews, and the extent to which the Hussite judaizing meant an actual conversion to Judaism, remain objects of debate. Ben Sasson, a Jerusalem historian, indicates Hussite conversion to Judaism was largely wish fulfillment fueled by millennialist expectations: "Objection to the complex of images, altars, crosses, priests was so strong in the soul of the Jews, and they longed so much to see the fulfillment of their hope that there would be a movement from Christianity toward Judaism, that they painted reality with the colors of their hearts' desires and began to discern, in what was happening, certain elements

of the disappearance of that complex and the fulfillment of the messianic hope."[129] The Hussites, like the Puritans 120 year later, hoped the Jews would convert, and probably Hussites and Jews took the conversion of the other group as a sign that the millennium was about to begin. Gladstein claims that one of Kara's poems was set to the tune of the Hussite battle song, "Ye Warriors of God." The Jews probably hoped that the song would scare off the crusaders when they sang it, as it had done more than once when Hussites sang it. There was no "better sign of the Jews' sympathy for the Hussites than the apparent adoption of their most representative tune."[130] Similarly, the Hussites found encouragement for their iconoclasm from the Jews who sang

> The mystery of faith is nowhere found
> Except among the Hebrews,
> Forbidden altars shall lie upon the ground.[131]

On May 1 or 2, 1420 King Sigismund's army started slowly but inexorably toward Prague. Sigismund demanded unconditional surrender. Since the fate of Jan Krasa was fresh in their minds, the Hussites and a large number of other Bohemians felt they had no choice but to unite with groups whose theology they found repugnant to keep Bohemia from being overrun by marauding German troops. And so the inhabitants of Prague, no matter what their political or religious views, prepared the town for a siege. "Wherever there had been one chain before to barricade the streets, they put two, and they locked themselves up against the King."[132]

On May 16, the Praguers sent an urgent call for assistance to Zizka, who understanding the tactical advantage of rapid troop deployment, responded without delay. Between 50 and 60 miles separated Zizka's 9,000 men from Prague when he got the call for help. According to the standards of medieval warfare, it should have taken him at least four days to march to Prague, but he left on May 18 and was in Benesov, half way to Prague, one day later. He arrived in Prague on May 20, even though he had to fight at Porici on the way.

His arrival was met by general jubilation among the inhabitants of Prague, who arranged banquets in honor of their rescuers. Their joy changed to consternation when the Taborite rustics, most of whom had never seen a city as luxurious as Prague, repaid their hosts by engaging in iconoclasm and even went so far as to attempt to cut off the beards and mustaches of the natives. The town had already undergone a Taborite purge of "public mortal sins." Notorious brothels had already been converted to more edifying use, and Zelivsky and his followers had conducted house to house searches, asking each household to make a choice between utraquism and leaving town, something that must have made the reaction of the Taborite rustics that much more painful.

Once again, ethnicity was given an ideological spin. Expelling everyone who disagreed, including the wives and children of Germans who had already

left, ensured "there would be no traitors at work in the city," but, more importantly, it pushed the Hussite movement in an irrevocably revolutionary direction.[133] Revolutionaries would take over the movement, something most Praguers must have viewed with consternation, when, for example, the women who had come from Tabor burned the monastery of St. Catherine in the New Town to the ground after evicting the nuns. It also ensured a bloody reaction since it established the principle that the most radical faction got to decide policy. The Hussites established that principle as normative by deducing it from their reading of the Old Testament. The ideologically chosen ethnic group was an idea that would wreak havoc in Europe for the next 600 years and in Israel and the Middle East after that.

Zizka had more pressing concerns. First he had to neutralize Vysehrad, the royalist stronghold south of town, so he ordered the moat dug deeper and wider. Once again Jews, women, priests, and boys too young to bear arms were put to work. By the time King Sigismund's armies arrived on June 12, Zizka had been at work for three weeks, digging fortifications outside the city and stretching chains and other impediments across the streets inside the town walls. Zizka was at a major disadvantage because large royalist fortresses blocked the western and southern approaches to the city. He also suffered a major setback when Sigismund replenished Hradcany on the west bank of the Vltava. That entire bank was occupied by imperial troops, who were close enough to shout insults and provocations at the natives. "Ha, Ha! Huss, Huss! Heretic, Heretic," the imperial forces shouted across the river, and, to show it was not merely good-natured ribbing, any Czechs who fell into their hands were immediately burnt as heretics. Lawrence of Brezova claims Sigismund had 150,000 troops under arms "of many different nations, tribes, and tongues.[134] Even if Sigismund had half that number of troops, he still had a four or five to one advantage over Zizka.

Sigismund's strategy was rational. Since he already controlled the southern and western approaches to the city, all he had to do was block access to the farms of the Elbe valley to the north, and the city would starve to death in days. That meant occupying the Vitkov Hill on the old town side of the river. Zizka understood the importance of the hill too and had two wooden forts built on its summit. On July 14, 1420 Sigismund's armies crossed the Vltava and started up the gradual northeast slope of Vitkov Hill, putting heavy pressure on the badly outnumbered defenders. Once again, the Hussites were aided by their choice of terrain. The narrow ridge they had to defend magnified the power of the defenders, neutralizing both the numbers and the cavalry of the attacking army and allowing time for reinforcement.

Zizka, who was in the town when the attack started, quickly ordered a counterattack. A priest holding a monstrance led the archers, who were followed by peasant soldiers wielding flails and pikes, all singing a Hussite battle song. Lawrence of Brezova claims it was the sight of the body of

Christ in the monstrance that routed the Hussites' enemies. The author of the *Magdeburger Schoeppenchronik* claimed that the Taborites had miraculous powers because the Bohemians worshipped the devil, whom the Germans had seen fighting alongside the Czech soldiers.[135]

Terror spread through the ranks of the numerically superior royalist army, and they fled back across the river in panic. The victory seemed doubly miraculous because the royalists had suffered relatively few casualties and yet were reluctant to renew the attack. There was no adequate military explanation for why Sigismund failed to renew his assault. Since he was still in possession of Hradcany, which towered over the town, he could have bombarded Prague, but he couldn't bring himself to destroy a city he loved.

During the siege of Prague the Four Articles were formulated in their final form. All faithful Bohemians were called to 1) communicate under both species, 2) promote free preaching, 3) force priests to give up pomp and avarice and worldly ambition and 4) bring about a cessation of all public mortal sins. The symbol of the Hussite Revolution was the chalice. Hussite soldiers wore the emblem of the chalice on their clothing, and royalist forces carried banners portraying a goose (Huss is the Czech word for goose) drinking from a chalice. The chalice was both a liturgical issue and an eschatological symbol. "For the Hussites, to drink the blood of God was a sign of the reality of the present age passing away into a grand apocalyptic finale. The cup signaled this *fait accompli*. . . . the chalice in particular heralded the arrival of the eschaton in the midst of the present age."[136] No one, however, seems to have made the connection between the chalice which held Christ's blood during celebration of the Mass and the bloodthirsty priests who took it as their symbol. But the connection is there: "the true soldiers of Jesus Christ—'the warriors of God'—must ever and again drink the blood of God so that they can engage in the battle against Antichrist."[137]

Once Sigismund condemned his huge army to a summer of inactivity, natural forces ensured its dissolution. Rotting corpses lay around the Imperial camp unburied in the summer heat insuring the spread of disease. On July 22, 16 German prisoners captured in the failed attack on Vitkov, now renamed Zizkov in honor of the general who saved it, were burned at the stake in view of the German troops, thus lowering morale even further. The same chronicler who said the Taborites worshipped the devil called the crusade a "truly hateful campaign, for whomever was taken prisoner on either side for him there was no other outcome but the inhumanly bitter death."[138] Finally, the Bohemian Lords crowned Sigismund King of Bohemia at St. Vitus Cathedral in the Hradcany fortress on July 28 and persuaded him that, with his goal accomplished, he could send the German troops home.

On August 10, 1420, a Taborite mob led by Wenceslas Koranda celebrated the lifting of the siege by sacking the great Cistercian monastery at Zbraslav, one of the most famous and most beautiful buildings in the country, burning

it to the ground. The monastery had no military significance. The siege of Prague was over. On finding the monastery deserted and undefended, the Taborite mob discovered wine the monks had left behind. After getting drunk in the wine cellar, the mob broke into the royal tomb, disinterred the corpse of King Wenceslas, put a crown of straw on his head, and, after placing him on the altar, poured wine over him, bellowing in drunken mockery that if the king were still alive he would be drinking with them.

The mob then lurched unsteadily back to Prague, where drunken Hussite priests led the mob in an attack against the royalist fortress of Vysehrad. The attack ended in disaster for the drunken Hussites, but even more disastrous was the effect on the morale of the citizens of Prague, who now looked upon the Taborites as "a band of irresponsible, unmanageable terrorists."[139]

On August 22, 1420 the Taborites abruptly left Prague. No reason was given. However, a few days earlier the Taborites had presented Prague with 12 demands, including one that specified that "under fixed penalties there not be allowed any drinking in taverns of any drink nor its sale on the street."[140] Having their taverns shut down by drunken looters must have struck Praguers as unreasonable. When they refused to go along, the Taborites left town. Zelivsky hoped the Taborites would remain, but not even packing the town council with a pro-Taborite group of councilmen could persuade them to stay. The Taborites were determined to make a total break with Rome by electing their own bishop, a schismatic act that would ensure that the Hussites could ordain their own clergy. Once they had their own bishop, the Taborites would shut the mouths of the university professors by trumping their authority. So they withdrew from Prague and declared war on the Roman church by creating their own national para-church with its own bishop.

In September, 1420, the Taborites elected Nicholas of Pelhrimov as their bishop, confirming their independence from Rome. The illicit consecration also exacerbated the theological conflict within Hussitism and took it one step closer to civil war. When Nicholas of Huss died on Christmas Eve 1420, the Hussite moderates, Lawrence of Brezova says, "thanked God that in His Grace He had delivered them from a cunning man who had used his knowledge to further not peace and love but disunity and hatred between the parties."[141] The Taborites, numbering around 4,000, plunged forward with their social experiment, abolishing private property and the distinctions between lord and servants, and providing for the inhabitants from a community chest administered by radical priests, who proclaimed there was no salvation outside of Tabor. With communism came the idea of total war. The Taborite priests acted as "ideological commissars," inciting bands of Taborite warriors to plunder and violence "by expounding [to them] the more bloody passages of the Old Testament."[142] Chiliasm and total war were indissolubly linked in the Taborite Utopia: heaven on earth was to be created by sword-wielding Taborite terrorists, guided by priests like Martin Huska. The antithesis of the

sword was the Cross; those who chose the former did so by rejecting the latter. Messianic politics always exerts its greatest appeal over those in rebellion against the reign of the Cross on earth and the attitude toward passivity and suffering the Cross entails. "Martin," Peter Chelcicky says, "was not humble or at all willing to suffer for Christ. . . . And he declared to us his belief that there will be a new Kingdom of the Saints on earth, and that the good will no longer suffer. . . . And he said, 'If Christians were always to have to suffer so, I would not want to be a servant of God.' That is what he said."[143]

On July 21, 1421, the Hussite moderates at the University of Prague triumphed over the radicals in the liturgical battle that had raged since the Taborites had issued their demands a year before. John Zelivsky then left Prague and his role there as demagogue and master of agit-prop who mobilized the masses, to try his hand as general in the northern Bohemian town of Most. Most was also known as Bruex, which indicates the large German population living there. Zelivsky laid siege to the town in July, damaging its walls with his siege guns. The town was willing to surrender, but Zelivsky was unwilling to negotiate with the largely German "Edomites" who were unworthy of anything but the sword. Zelivsky's refusal to negotiate was a costly mistake; the margrave of Meissen was already marching to lift the siege. Had Zelivsky accepted Most's terms, he could have defended Most from behind fortified walls. Had Zelivsky used traditional Hussite battle tactics, he could have engaged the German army, which was roughly the same size as his, at the top of a hill surrounded by trenches and battlewagons. Zelivsky, however, moved by his vision of himself as the Old Testament warrior, did neither. Instead, he met the Meissner army in an open field north of town, where the Germans used their superior armed cavalry to rout the Hussites, who fled in panic back to Prague. In a war where the outcome of each battle was a crucial test of God's favor, Zelivsky's defeat had devastating psychological *sequelae*, calling into question the legitimacy of the cause rather than just his competence as a general.

Zelivsky could have benefited from Zizka's advice, but the Hussite Napoleon was on that day besieging the town of Rabi. That day would prove disastrous for Zizka too. Displeased by the siege's progress, Zizka decided to move closer to Rabi, within the range of the archers manning the town's walls. An archer loosed an arrow that struck Zizka in his right eye, blinding him completely. Zizka was immediately packed off to Prague for treatment, but infection set in, and Zizka's previously good eye was lost. Aeneas Sylvius, no friend of Zizka, editorialized: "*Coeco populo coecus placuit ductor*"; "A blind nation was happy to follow a blind leader,"[144] but he also says with astonishment that Zizka's total blindness did not impair his abilities as a general. Zizka won his most famous battles while blind. "Future generations," Aeneas Sylvius adds, "will be astonished by this story rather than believe it."[145]

Fresh from presiding over one of the few Hussite defeats in the war, Zelivsky returned to Prague and orchestrated a political coup that made him Prague's dictator. If Zizka was the Hussite military genius, its Napoleon, then Zelivsky was the Hussite Robespierre. Zelivsky was a genius at manipulating unruly urban masses in town meetings and popular assemblies, and using those meetings to concentrate power in his hands. Zelivsky then used this power to eliminate his enemies. On October 20, one day after the coup, Zelivsky had Sadlo of Smilkov arrested and then executed on the following evening. Zelivsky would arrest many more before his reign of terror ended five months later with his own death.

Once Zelivsky was driven from power, the theological split in the Hussites became a geographical split too. After Zelivsky's death, the moderates controlled Prague, and the revolutionaries controlled Tabor, and the contest between them over who controlled Bohemia would become a military conflict and a civil war. The Taborites were determined to continue the revolution, "even if this meant fighting the conservative Hussites" and even if that meant "renouncing any hope of really regenerating—that is, revolutionizing—the society of Bohemia."[146]

But the Taborites soon learned that a "revolutionary society" is a contradiction in terms, for they had to deal with a rebellion within their own ranks. Under the leadership of the Taborite priest Peter Kanish (or Kanis), a group of Taborites convinced themselves the millennium had already arrived; all that remained was to act accordingly. Kanish told his followers that all human impulses came from God and were manifestations of God; since there was no original sin, it was wrong to curb any sexual desire; they, as a result, were as "innocent as Adam and Eve in paradise,"[147] hence their name, Adamites. Salvation was a matter of the will following unbridled appetite, an idea which would find its fulfillment in the sexual revolutionary theories of Wilhelm Reich in the 20th century. Salvation was at hand for those bold enough to take off their clothes. Since they had achieved the state of innocence promised to Adam and Eve, the Adamites had no need of clothes or morals and shed both, which scandalized the moderate Hussite Lawrence of Brezova, who described them as "wandering through forests and hills," where "some of them fell into such insanity that men and women threw off their clothes and went nude, saying that clothes had been adopted because of the sin of the first parents, but that they were in a state of innocence. From the same madness they supposed that they were not sinning if one of the brethren had intercourse with one of the sisters, and if the woman conceived, she said she had conceived of the Holy Spirit."[148]

Eventually the Adamites settled on an island in the Nezarka River, from which they would periodically sally forth and plunder local villages and farms, stealing food and livestock and murdering the inhabitants. The Adamites were natural supernaturalists in the judaizing mode. Nicholas, a peasant

who led them for a while, took the name Moses-Adam. Moses informed them they had "regained fully the state of innocence which Adam and Eve had enjoyed in Paradise." As a result, they discarded all clothing, and "not minding heat or cold, went naked at all times."[149] They held that God was only in themselves, just as there was no devil except in humans. Since "all impulses were considered good, even divine. The sexual desire was not to be inhibited in the least." "[I]t was a sin for the desired partner to refuse. All men had all women in common, marriage was prohibited, and they liked to engage in group dances which would end as group orgies."[150] Of course, the license Moses-Adam conferred acted as a form of control, too. The chaste could not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, but faithful Adamites could not have sex without his permission. In this, Moses-Adam predated the sexual liberation gurus of the 20th century, who also attached political conditions to the permission slips they distributed. As if to prove that the concupiscible and irascible passions were closely connected, the Adamites "went out at night, surprising the villages in the neighborhood, taking food and pitilessly killing all inhabitants, men, women, children, even the babies in their cradles."[151]

The revolution reached a crisis that every subsequent revolution would also reach and from which none would recover. How was one to determine the limits of the revolutionary movement? The answer was clear. Since there was no internal principle of order in revolution—revolution being the antithesis of order—order was imposed by force from without, in this case by John Zizka and his ally Lord Ulrich Vavak, who hunted the Adamites down and destroyed them after a pitched battle in October 1421. Zizka took the surviving Adamites to Klokoty, a village in sight of Tabor, and tried to convince them of their errors. Failing, he burned 50 at the stake and sent the rest, 25 in all, to Tabor where they too were burnt at the stake. Only one Adamite was spared so an account of their depravities might be written for posterity. Zizka thus halted the leftward drift of the revolution and single-handedly took control of it through the imposition of physical force.

The Hussite conservatives in Prague felt vindicated because they saw in the Adamites the logical extension of Tabor, which is to say, "the subversion of all traditional law and order."[152] Commentators like John Pribram, trying to understand a movement that had passed so effortlessly from pacifism to revolutionary violence, began to see that revolution, although unknown previously in Europe, was a category of its own. Revolution had no stable content, but it did have a predictable trajectory. Taborite or Adamite freedom meant freedom from order. The trajectory meant that "infallibly, every sort of license will be given to every error, every path hitherto closed will be opened to all perversity, and in short order the world will resist not the worst errors and irremediable enormities . . .[until] they have broken up their own unity into innumerable parts. . . and it would be hard to find among them two men who agree with each other."[153] By the time of the French revolution, Saturn

would become the revolution's model because, like Saturn, the revolution always devoured its own children. By the time of the Russian revolution, when the revolutionary Jew was seen as the specter haunting Europe, that saw would be modified to say that every revolution devoured its own Jews.

In the aftermath of the Elizabethan coup in England, Shakespeare would grapple with the same phenomena in the speech Agammemnon delivers in *Troilus and Cressida*. The speech begins, "Take but degree away, untune that string/ And hark what discord follows." There was a rational order to society, which got contradicted by revolution, which had no order but had a trajectory in which appetite imposed its will by force and ended up devouring itself. If the lawful order is turned upside down by revolution,

> Force should be right, or rather, right and wrong
> Between whose endless jar justice resides,
> Should lose their names and so should justice too.
> Then everything includes itself in power,
> Power into will, will into appetite,
> And appetite, a universal wolf,
> So doubly seconded with will and power,
> Must make perforce a universal prey,
> And last eat up himself.

Once the Taborites embarked on revolution, force became their arbiter; John Zizka would become the revolution's undisputed leader because he was a genius in applying the most brutal force, namely, military force.

In December, Zizka started for Kutna Hora to battle the Imperial forces once more. Kutna Hora was famous for its silver mines and treasury; the Germans who worked in the mines were devoted supporters of Sigismund and equally fervent in their hatred of the Hussites. The Germans took revenge on captured Hussites by throwing them down an abandoned mineshaft, which with mordant irony they named Tabor. When Zizka arrived at Kutna Hora, the town promptly surrendered, providing access to rich silver mines and solving the Hussites' money problems. Zizka rejoiced too soon. Sigismund's Hungarian mercenaries marched on Kutna Hora, burning Czech villages along the way, raping and mutilating anyone unfortunate enough to get in their way. When they came within artillery range of Zizka's troops, the perfidious Germans seized the city and began slaughtering the Czechs Zizka had left there to guard his back and to provide refuge if need be. On the night of December 21, Zizka was completely surrounded and, from any realistic military assessment, doomed.

More accurately, any other general would have considered himself doomed. Without waiting for morning, Zizka organized one of the most daring and innovative counteroffensives in the history of warfare. Relying on the battlewagons that had saved him so often in the past, he turned them into

offensive weapons—the first time that wagons were used that way in warfare. Part of his genius lay in putting mobile artillery to use offensively; before that time it had only been used as stationary siege guns. Creating the 15th century equivalent of the tank, Zizka broke out of the pocket into which Sigismund's troops had driven him. "They marched forward," Lawrence of Brezova says, describing Zizka's daring move, "and by shooting at the enemy with their guns they drove the King with his whole army from the positions they had held."[154] By morning, Zizka had escaped certain defeat again. Zizka, under the pressure of direst necessity, had invented field artillery as an offensive weapon, an invention that would affect warfare for centuries.

A little over three months after that battle, the radical wing of the Hussite movement in Prague collapsed when Zelivsky, the Bohemian Robespierre, was lured to a meeting and assassinated by Hussite moderates on March 9, 1422. Jacobellus of Stribro presided over the execution of Zelivsky and nine of his lieutenants. Jacobellus was appalled at Zelivsky's constant demagoguery and subversion. Zelivsky's death set off a riot in Prague. The body of Taborite revolutionaries writhed in pain like a snake without a head, but the man who could control the mob and put their anger to political use was gone. For the first time in the Hussite revolution, a pogrom broke out. A mob from the New Town attacked the ghetto, causing considerable damage. Either the conservatives attacked the Jews because they collaborated with the judaizing Zelivsky faction, or, more probably, the Zelivsky faction attacked the Jews because they felt the Jews had switched sides and collaborated in his murder. Either way, the revolution died in Prague when Zelivsky died. "And from this time the Praguers and the Taborites began fighting one another."[155]

Tabor was now a theocracy led by military priests who saw themselves as the successors of Joshua, David, and other Old Testament warriors, fighting at the head of a "holy nation" for a sacred cause. By the time Tabor separated irrevocably from Prague, the clergy had taken over all functions of government, an irony the opponents of monasticism overlooked in their revolutionary fervor. John Capek, the radical priest whose writings were "filled more with blood than a pond with water,"[156] was a good example of the judaizing clergy. In his *Tractatus contra articulos errores picardorum*, John Pribram compiled 76 errors that, in his view, characterized the bloodthirsty priests who governed Tabor. Article 31 claimed the Taborite clergy "condemned all who failed to use the sword in shedding the blood . . . of the enemies of Christ."[157] Article 32 said the Taborite clergy claimed "that all priests of Christ may lawfully kill sinners," a position which, Fudge notes, "went well beyond Zizka's position which forbade priests to engage in battle."[158] Priests in Zizka's army were to carry the monstrance into battle, not to wield the sword, but Tabor went far beyond that. Whereas Zelivsky had driven everyone who would not accept the four articles out of town on the eve of the battle of Vitkov Hill, the Taborites, according to Pribram's indictment, decreed "those who steadfastly refused

to assist in this holy battle were deemed members of the satanic host and were to be slain."[159] Capek "called for the physical and material destruction of all persons refusing to assist in this great task."[160] Pribram and the Prague Hussites were understandably appalled by the fanaticism of the Taborites, who were now a greater threat to Bohemia than the "Romans." According to Pribram, reform in Bohemia "can only be achieved if those who are infected with errors or who defend heresies denounce them and reconcile themselves to the Church, not, however, if they oppose the Church and even rebel against their kind and natural lord, thus adding to the infamy of heresy the crime and infamy of lese majesty."[161]

Pribram's objections were based on theory and practice. The ranting of the bloodthirsty Taborite priests had practical consequences. When Ferdinand, Bishop of Lucena, the papal legacy, arrived in Bohemia, he saw "with his own eyes what otherwise he would have hardly believed: burned monasteries, mutilated images of saints, the expulsion and even the murder of priests and monks—with the result that in many churches divine service had been restricted, in some had totally ceased."[162] Taborite iconoclasts had devastated the entire country, but Prague suffered the most because it had the most to lose. On August 6, 1423, a Taborite mob burned one of the country's most beautiful monasteries to the ground, that of the Kings of the Cross on the Zderaz in the New Town. The Taborite mob looked upon the elaborate vestments, altars, and sacred vessels of gold and silver as Babylon, but the Praguers saw them as their own cultural patrimony. Praguers didn't want that patrimony destroyed by rustic barbarians from the south. When the iconoclasm threatened to spread from the New Town to the Old, Praguers intervened. When word spread that the monastery of St. James was going to be sacked and burned by the Taborites, the butchers of Old Town formed a human wall around the building and saved it.

The papal legate astutely understood the tension between Prague and Tabor and cleverly played the conservatives off against the radicals, claiming he was "amazed" that the people of Prague, "who glory in the feeling of being the zealous followers of the Law of God and who are ready to stand with it and, if need be, die for it, have received within your defense the enemies of God, or that you can possibly expect any help from such people."[163] The legate went through the Four Articles one by one, giving them an orthodox interpretation that widened the gulf between Prague and Tabor. Commenting on the second article, which demanded "freedom of preaching," the legate said, "If it means that any person can freely preach, and preach as he pleases, then it is not in order, especially not if the preaching is directed against the doctrines of the Church."[164] The Praguers were coming to the same conclusion after seeing where unrestrained preaching led. Commenting on the Third Article, which complained about the riches of the Church, the legate said, "it seems that your desire is rather to acquire their property than to establish the example of

a pure life."[165] If Sigismund and the Council of Constance had proceeded like that, much bloodshed would have been avoided. As we have seen, the Hussite revolt had a trajectory but no internal principle of order. As a result, "Hussite unity tended to weaken whenever the pressure from outside relented."[166] Eventually the Church split Prague from Tabor when it persuaded the Hussite moderates to accept the Basel Compactata: The Church was willing to grant the Hussites the Chalice if the Hussites were willing to turn away from revolution. Fudge claims "the Hussite ranks had successfully been divided by conciliar diplomacy," masterminded by the archdeacon of Barcelona, Juan Palomar,[167] but the Praguers weren't tricked. They had learned in the expensive school of experience how destructive revolutions were.

By August 1423, the theological discussions between Prague and Tabor had ceased, and open warfare took their place. One month earlier, Zizka had issued his famous military rule, differentiating his position from that of the bloodthirsty Tabor priests. He then moved his base of operations from Tabor to a town more congenial to his views. In August of 1423, Zizka led his army against the Praguers in the battle of Strachuv Dvur. Each army approached the other with a priest holding the monstrance, a practice the judaizing Hussites referred to as carrying the ark. It was the first time ark fought ark;[168] Zizka was furious at having his own psychological warfare techniques used against him. There could not be two Israelite armies carrying two separate arks, so Zizka resolved theological conflict once again by brute force. Zizka was appalled that a priest could "dare to lead his troops under the sacred symbol of the Body of Christ, against him Zizka, the selected instrument of God's will and the true Servant of His Law."[169] He was so appalled that "full of flaming indignation," he "let his battle club fall on the man's skull," showing "Zizka the man in his uninhibited fanaticism and his fierce self-righteousness, doubly blind when a sudden rage darkened his mind."[170] Zizka had worked with revolutionary priests, but he never really got along with them. He had conflicts with Wenceslas Koranda and John Zelivsky. His frustration finally found an outlet in killing one who had the effrontery to question his spiritual authority by carrying an ark into battle against him.

Once the opposing ark of Prague appeared to deprive Zizka of the last shred of theological legitimacy, there was little to distinguish his activities from mere "revolutionary banditry."[171] When Zizka died of the plague in October 1424, Aeneas Sylvius said of him "only death defeated the undefeated."[172] In the five years that he led the Hussite army, Zizka never lost a battle even though he was blind in one eye when he began his career as the general of the Hussites at 60 years old and blind in both eyes when that career ended undefeated with his death. Zizka single-handedly put an end to medieval warfare. Because of Zizka, Czech words like "pistol" and "howitzer" entered the military lexicon. Zizka was also a master fortress-builder. It was he who designed the hill-top redoubt on a peninsula formed by the Luznice River and the Tismenice Creek

known as Tabor, and it was he who turned it into something that was literally impregnable. And he did all this in the midst of unprecedented political and religious turmoil.

Legend says his followers made a drum out of his skin and beat the drum whenever they went into battle. Like Cromwell, the historical figure who most closely resembled him, Zizka found no lasting resting place. In 1622, the Hapsburgs dug up Zizka's remains and buried them under the gallows in Caslav, a fate Cromwell's headless corpse shared 40 years later, when the supporters of Charles II hanged his corpse at Tyburn. As with Cromwell, historians are divided in assessing Zizka's legacy. V. V. Tomek claims Zizka was "almost a conservative at heart and a revolutionary only in his rebellion against Sigismund; in short what might be called the George Washington of the Czech revolution."[173] Josef Pekar, though, calls Zizka

> A rabid revolutionary, ever driven by his religious fanaticism, rarely accessible to the voice of reason or of constructive patriotism, personally bloodthirsty and vindictive and on occasion deceitful, even treacherous. . . . Zizka. . . is essentially a destructive force, his role in Bohemian history was predominantly damaging.[174]

For ten years after Zizka's death, the only armies that could defeat his troops, who now called themselves "Orphans," were other Hussite troops who had learned the art of war from him too. His soldiers continued to fight; as the heirs of messianic politics they had no choice and as peasants who had abandoned their homes and fields, they had no other way of making a living. Soon the army attracted freebooters, who used the sanction of holy war as an excuse to live by pillaging their neighbors. The more the Orphans succeeded, the more freebooters they attracted; lust for gain replaced religious fervor as the prime motivation. But by then, their reputation as the scourge of God preceded them. By August 1431, the Hussites struck terror into their foes simply by singing battle songs and rolling wagons to the front.

Ironically, but not unsurprisingly, a priest succeeded Zizka at the head of the revolutionary Hussite army. During the last seven years of the Hussite revolution, from 1426 to 1434, Zizka's successor was the priest Prokop the Bald. Under Prokop, the Hussite revolution fulfilled its messianic destiny by taking the true gospel as espoused by the Holy Nation of Bohemia to the rest of the world. Prokop the Bold led the Hussite armies to conquer other lands, something Zizka never did. Hussite armies, using Zizka's innovations, were invincible, and they fought to the Baltic and back without a defeat. Each campaign was accompanied by psychological warfare that spread Hussite pamphlets across Europe, an amazing feat before the printing press. From Poland to Spain, from Italy to England, Hussite troops spread the idea of revolution as Napoleon's troops would 400 years later. In the minds of the vulgar, winning a battle was the best theological argument possible. Zizka's

army thus gave Hussite revolutionary ideas a credibility they could not have earned on their merits.

Prokop may have led Hussite armies abroad, but he was no Zizka. Dispensing himself from the vow of celibacy, Prokop married. He also allowed himself to be lured from Zizka's military principles. At the battle of Lipany in 1434, Prokop's troops were lured out of their battlewagons, whereupon the calvary promptly slaughtered them in the open field. Aeneas Sylvius had the last word on Prokop too. Like his mentor Zizka, Prokop died at Lipany "wearied with conquering, rather than conquered himself."[175] A little over two years later, the moderate Hussites signed the Basel Compactata ending their participation in the revolution. Roman diplomacy had succeeded where Sigismund's arms had failed. On September 7, 1437, the last pocket of Taborite resistance collapsed when the castle Sion near Kutna Hora fell and John Rohac of Duba was captured. Rohac was taken to Prague, tortured, and then hanged by a gold chain from the topmost rung of a three story gallows. More than 50 of his co-conspirators were hanged from the lower rungs. The hapless Sigismund, who lived long enough to see his enemies defeated and Prague returned to him as its king, had little time to savor his victory. Sigismund's leg soon became inflamed with the "fire of hell,"[176] in the words of one chronicler. His leg was amputated one piece at a time, but he could find no relief from the fire of hell and died shortly after Rohac.

Their deaths marked the end of the Hussite rebellion, but not the end of revolution in Europe. By the time the revolution burned itself out in Bohemia, toxins carried like smoke by its armies had contaminated large sections of central Europe. The Hussite Revolution was a watershed. It was fundamentally unlike the peasant revolts of the 14th century, but very similar to the revolts that would follow. Heymann calls it "the first in the great chain of European revolutions which helped to shape the character of modern, Western society."[177] The Hussite Revolution, like "the Dutch Revolution, the Puritan Revolution in England, the American Revolution and the Great French Revolutions," was "successful" because it "involved the whole of society" and in its wake left "a profoundly changed society."[178] Like the English revolution of the 16th century, the Hussite revolution took land from the Church and gave it to the nobles, increasing their power at the expense of the peasants, who now started towards their destiny as an impoverished proletariat. "The Hussite wars," Heymann continues, "thus can be regarded as the beginning of the long process of the secularization of land which went on, in varying forms almost all over Europe until the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars in the main finished this job."[179]

The term "Bohemian" took on its pejorative meaning as a result of the Hussite Revolution, because they

> now became so strong and mighty and so arrogant that they were feared on all sides and all honest folk were terrified lest the roguery and disorder should spread to other peoples and turn against all who were decent and law-abiding and against the rich. For it [the Bohemian Hussite revolution] was the very thing for the poor who did not want to work, yet were insolent and pleasure-loving. There were many such in all countries, coarse and worthless people who encouraged the Bohemians in their heresy and unbelief as much as ever they could.[180]

Before long "Bohemians" showed up in neighboring German kingdoms, preaching the gospel of revolution. Forty years after the battle of Lipany, the seer Hans Boehm (a name which indicated his Bohemian origin) arrived in the Bavarian town of Niklashausen, claiming the Blessed Mother had informed him that the messianic Kingdom was at hand. Endorsed by the local parish priest, Boehm organized a mass movement that quickly became revolutionary. When Boehm was arrested, he was found preaching naked in a tavern, reminiscent of how the Bohemian Adamites "had represented symbolically the return of the state of nature to a corrupted world."[181] After Hans Boehm was arrested, the revolutionary sickness broke out next in Thuringia.

In February 1453, Breslau was awaiting the arrival of St. John Capistrano. The Franciscan preacher from Italy had a reputation as a fearless opponent of the enemies of the Church. In Italy he had taken on the Fraticelli, and the princes and bishops of southeastern Germany wanted him to take on the Hussites. Breslau (now known as Wroclaw) had staunchly defended Catholic orthodoxy in the face of repeated Hussite assault; Capistrano came to praise them for their faithfulness and to preach daily sermons during Lent. On Ash Wednesday, he began the sermons he would give, one a day, for the next 40 days. By Easter, Capistrano's health had broken under the strain, and he needed to recuperate. Once healthy enough to travel, he answered the summons of the bishop of nearby Neisse, who sought his council.

Troubling news followed Capistrano to Neisse. During Holy Week, some Jews of Breslau had bribed a Polish peasant to break into the village church and steal a ciborium full of sacred hosts. As the peasant hurried through an open field on his way to rendezvous with those Jews, a thunderstorm struck. Seized with panic, he threw the ciborium away, but not before he removed ten or eleven hosts, which were taken via the wife of a soldier to the Jews in Breslau. Twenty Jews then assembled in their synagogue and abused the hosts verbally and by assaulting them with whips and knives. When the Jews stabbed the host, blood spurted out of it a meter high. So much blood poured out of the desecrated hosts onto both perpetrators and bystanders that the instruments of torture could not be cleansed and had to be disposed of in a nearby brook.

When the crime became known, the militia moved into the Jewish quarter and rounded up its inhabitants, interning them at the castle of King Ladislaus.

Ladislaus ordered an investigation; during the investigation, Meyer, one of the main suspects in the case, committed suicide. According to Graetz's account, "a Jew by the name of Meyer . . . who had bought a sacred host from a peasant, stabbed it, desecrated it, and distributed parts of it to Jewish communities in Schweidnitz, Liegnitz and elsewhere so that they could do likewise. It goes without saying that the wounded Host shed blood. This ridiculous fairy tale . . . was of course widely believed. A number of Jews from Breslau were immediately thrown into jail."[182]

In May, Capistrano returned to Breslau. On June 14, the bishop, fearing innocent Jews might be implicated, asked Capistrano to investigate. Graetz's attitude is indicated by his use of the term "fairy tale." His sarcasm bespeaks an attempt to cover over sensational revelations that emerged during the trial but are unmentioned in his account. During the trial, a baptized Jewess, the wife of a citizen of Breslau, accused her father of engaging in a similar ritual 16 years earlier. That Jew had bought consecrated hosts from a woman and had then taken them to a cellar in Loewenberg, where he tried to burn them. Three times he threw the hosts into fire and three times they leaped out again, until an old Jewess who had come to witness the desecration exclaimed that, having witnessed this miracle, she now believed in the God of the Christians. The Jews flew into a rage and murdered her on the spot. They then burned her body and buried it in the same place. The Jews then took the host, placed it on a small table, and cut it into four parts, causing it to bleed so profusely that neither table nor knife could be washed clean, so both had to be thrown into a nearby stream. The same woman also testified that a child had been murdered for ritual purposes in the cellar.[183]

Acting on her testimony, the court sent a delegation to the house where the desecration allegedly took place 16 years earlier. There they dug up what looked like the charred remains of a fire as well as the bones of a woman and a child. Capistrano, we are told, handled these bones during the trial. Graetz holds Capistrano responsible for the outcome of the trial, which resulted, he claims, in the death of 41 Jews. Hofer disputes the number, but no one denies that Jews were executed for blasphemy and murder. In addition, 300 Jews were deported, and their children were taken from them, baptized, and put in Christian homes. "Capistrano," Graetz writes, "presided over them on the bench, as the court moved toward the verdict."[184] He concludes his attack on Capistrano by calling him a "Jew slaughterer" and a "cannibal."[185]

Johannes Hofer tells a different story. Capistrano did indeed hold the bones of the boy in his hands during the trial, but that evidence and the way in which it was found convinced everyone that the Jews were guilty. Hofer also claims Capistrano was merely an advisor and did not preside over the trial. Capistrano, according to Hofer,

> had nothing to do with the arrest of the Jews, nor was the supreme direction of the trial in his hands. During the first two weeks after the arrest, he was not in Breslau at all, but was the guest of the Bishop at Neisse. . . . That he acted thus in obedience to the express wish of the prudent and moderate Bishop, who insisted that the trial be ended before the departure of his guests, puts the affair in an entirely different light.[186]

How could the court have come to another verdict? Not even Capistrano's most vocal critics doubted the guilt of the Jews who were on trial. "Jewish historians mention Capistrano's name with horror," Hofer writes, but

> On the other hand, Jewish historians go decidedly too far when they band all such accusations as mere fables or psychological impossibilities. Unimpeachable evidence shows that cases of robbery and desecration of consecrated Hosts did occur in the Middle Ages, and still occur in our own days. Admitting that Jews as a class were not guilty, what reason can be given for denying that individual Jews never gave vent to their hatred of Christ by committing such crimes?[187]

Hofer concedes "Christians were guilty of grievous injustice when, instead of punishing individuals who were guilty, they punished also the innocent majority. They were also guilty of credulity in easily accepting the charges against Jews."[188] The evidence, however, indicates that at least some Jews were guilty of murder and sacrilege, both of which were capital crimes. Capistrano's presence on the tribunal made no difference because "Sacrileges were punished by death. That was the general European practice, which meted out the death penalty for much lesser crimes. Even the banishment of all Jews corresponded in such cases with the general view of the public. Jews were merely tolerated. The state believed itself justified, whenever public welfare required, in banishing Jews and confiscating their property."[189]

Given the evidence, the Jews would have been found guilty whether Capistrano was there or not. Furthermore, if the Jews were guilty of capital crimes, Capistrano cannot be termed a slaughterer of Jews. Hence, Graetz's portrayal of the charges as "a ridiculous fairy tale" ignores both the evidence and the law. His intent was to smear Capistrano. The state had the right to punish criminals. If "the Silesian Jews, in fact, commit[ed] the crimes which they were accused of," Hofer points out, "Capistran's position is unassailable. Ritual murder, sacrilegious crimes, would even today be punished. The sentences of 1453 were entirely in harmony with contemporary European ideas of justice."[190]

Some Jewish historians, including Graetz, claim that since the evidence was *prima facie* fantastic, the Jews were victims of a plot "set in motion," Hofer claims, "to get rid of pressing creditors."[191] It is easier, however, to accept the evidence for blasphemy and murder than to find evidence of a plot:

> The detailed account of the robberies, the precise reports on places and times, the definite description of all persons concerned, even of accused Christians, all this must incline us to believe in the trustworthiness of the charges. . . . If this whole procedure was owing to a plot, its extraordinary ingenuity and precaution become historically remarkable. With all allowances for the imperfect juridical procedure of those days, and for the prejudices of judges, how shall we account for the remarkable fact that even those who condemned the expulsion of the Jews as unchristian, still do not manifest the least doubt about the truth of the accusations. Take for instance, Peter Eschenloer, who came to Breslau in 1455, and in 1470 wrote of the affair in the sense just quoted. Nearly 20 years had passed when he wrote, 15 of which he had spent on the spot. Must we admit a plot so deep that none of the real facts ever came to the knowledge of the public? And if we admit such a plot, then we must also say that the judges were the victims of invincible error.[192]

Graetz also claims Capistrano was indirectly responsible for the trial because he inflamed public opinion against the Jews during his Lenten sermons. Hofer, however, points out that of the 40 sermons, only one referred to the Jews. In it Capistrano urged the citizens of Breslau not to refrain from work on Saturday, lest the Jews interpret this as participation in their Sabbath celebration. Capistrano did not preach sermons on the Jews or to the Jews in Breslau because Breslau, especially in comparison to Vienna and Nueremberg, had an insignificant Jewish population. According to Hofer, "The popular conception of Capistran thundering for forty days against the Jews is the purest fiction."[193]

What was Capistrano's position on the Jews? Hofer says his "general attitude toward the Jews stands out clearly in his sermons,"[194] which according to the custom of the day, Jews were forced to attend. In those sermons, he urged Jews to convert to Christianity. "The usual imagination," Hofer writes, "that on such occasions he aroused popular sentiments against the Jews is not true."[195] In a sermon in Vienna, which had a large Jewish population, Capistrano claimed that Jews felt they were entitled to kill Christians but would never say this publicly because of their small numbers.[196]

He preached to the Jews in "sorrow and disappointment" at their failure to respond to Christ's call to conversion.[197] He did not treat them with contempt. Like all medievals, Capistrano would have found the notion of racial hatred incomprehensible. The Jews were the enemies of Christians not because of their DNA, but because they had rejected Christ, and because the first consequence of that rejection was a war of subversion against Christian faith and morals and the culture based on it. "The Jewish question," for Capistrano, "is a religious one."[198] Once the Jew accepted baptism, there was no difference between him and the Christian. In one sermon, Capistrano claimed that were the Jews to hear the word of God, he would love them as he loved his

nearest relatives. Faith, however, can never be compelled. The Jews can only be invited to believe.

If the Jews refuse to accept Christianity certain consequences follow. The first is that Christians must be protected from subversive and predatory activity, and this can only be accomplished by complete segregation. In this, he was stricter than St. Thomas Aquinas. Even after they have been segregated, Jews should not be allowed "privileges that would weaken or abrogate those protective measures of Christian society."[199] Capistrano never tired of preaching about the bad effects of usury on Christian society. As a result he "urges that spiritual rulers insist on the strict observance of the laws concerning Jews and on the abrogation of contrary privileges. In this effort he did not stand alone. Many other reformers condemned the arbitrariness and laxity manifested in this matter."[200]

Capistrano left Breslau after the trial and went to Poland, which had a significant Jewish population that was growing steadily, and whose privileges, especially usury and tax-farming, would cause Poland serious problems in the coming centuries. The Jews did not, however, receive Capistrano's undivided attention. When they met with King Casimir in Cracow, Capistrano and Bishop Zbigniew urged him to deal with both the Hussites and the Jews. According to Graetz's account, Capistrano "threatened him with the punishments of hell and prophesied a bad outcome in the war against the Prussian Knights if he didn't revoke the favorable privileges of the Jews and hand the Hussite heretics over to the bloodthirsty clergy."[201] When the war with the Teutonic Knights went badly, Graetz claims Capistrano attributed the defeat of the Polish army to the "privileges given to the Jews."[202]

After we peel away the invective, Graetz admits the Jews had been granted privileges by the princes across central Europe. Unlike Capistrano, Graetz undoubtedly considered this good, but that is no indictment of Capistrano. Capistrano was convinced that privilege for the Jews led inevitably to moral laxity and subversion of the faith. As Graetz well knew, Jews were granted privileges not out of humanitarian concern; they were granted privileges because they granted financial concessions to the prince, specifically loans at lower interest rates. To make money available to the prince on favorable terms, Jews were granted the privilege of lending to the burgher and peasant at usurious rates. Once Jews got the prince in their debt, they could demand other concessions too—the privilege to live among Christians, the privilege not to wear the badge which distinguished them from the Christians, etc. Each of these privileges allowed the Jew closer contact with Christians, contact which he could then exploit to his advantage. Capistrano was against privilege for the Jews because whenever there was free contact between Jews and Christians, the faith was endangered and morals suffered.

Capistrano felt that Jews, because of their rejection of Christ, and not because of their race, were a constant danger to any Christian society. His

thought paralleled the thinking of popes as expressed in "*Sicut Judaeis non.*" Capistrano felt that the Jew could be tolerated but certainly not privileged. According to Hofer, Capistrano's attitude was a function of his idea that the Christian state served as "the Christian empire of God here on earth."[203] According to Capistrano's idea, "Christ is King, and Christ's Church is the kingdom of God. The Jews are the descendants of those who killed this king. They have inherited hatred against Christ from their ancestors, and they give it full vent wherever they can do so with impunity. Therefore we are justified in suspecting them. They are now simply our enemies and are known as such. They have crucified our Lord Jesus Christ."[204]

Capistrano's recommendations for social policy flowed from that premise. Christians should not associate with Jews, so, *a fortiori*, they should not become dependent on Jews "in any shape or form."[205] Usury is one of the most debilitating forms of dependence; therefore, princes should not allow Jews the privilege of taking usury. According to Hofer:

> To prevent commercial and social contacts by strict enforcement of the laws concerning Jews, and to abrogate all privilege that stood against this plan, was the fundamental idea of Capistran's policy. How far did he succeed? That he deeply injured Jewish interests in many lands is the assertion of Jewish historians. Detailed proof of that assertion is lacking. In Italy he did succeed in having edicts issued to abrogate Jewish privileges.[206]

Because he saw the deleterious results of contact between Jews and Christians, Capistrano took the rigorist position. When asked if Christians were permitted to buy from Jews those parts of butchered animals which the Jews for ritual reasons discarded as unclean, Capistrano said, no, because "Christians would thus appear inferior in the eyes of Jews. The Jews consider unclean anything touched by Christians. Why should Christians take and use what is set aside by the wicked hands of unbelieving and perfidious Jews? Let the Jews buy and eat what they like. That is their own business. But let them have no occasion to think contemptuously of our immaculate faith and to consider themselves better than us."[207]

He took a similar position when asked if Christians could buy wine from Jews. Again the answer was, no, because "Our dignity forbids us to consume the dirt that falls from their hands and feet when they tread the grapes. In many cities matters are so regulated that the Jews buy grapes for their own use. Their unholy feet must never soil that wine which our priests use in the Holy Sacrifice. From their own meat let the Jews make offerings according to their custom. Or, if they will, let them feed that meat to the dogs who catch the quails and pheasants for their delicious banquets."[208] Capistrano, according to Hofer, felt "our Lord Jesus Christ" would "be grieved by association between His perfidious enemies and His faithful people."[209]

An age which thinks of every form of particular association as discriminatory has a difficult time viewing Capistrano's indictment of the Jews objectively. An age in which the idea of the common good has evaporated, or an age that celebrates selfishness as a virtue, is in no position to throw stones at an age that occasionally made an entire race responsible for individual crimes. The corporate sense, so developed in the Middle Ages, had its dark side in that the innocent could be lumped with the guilty, one of the fears of the bishop of Neisse during the trials in Breslau. But the issues need to be separated to understand them. St. John Capistrano was no Jew-hater. He loved the Jews because he knew that the Jews were the enemies of the Church and that Christians were bound to love their enemies. His efforts to convert them were an expression of that love, no matter how the Jews construed them.

Capistrano also loved his fellow Christians, and his campaign against Jewish privilege expressed that love, because he saw how the average man suffered under debt when the princes granted the Jews privileges that enriched the prince and the Jews but impoverished everyone else. The privileges granted to the Jews caused concern to anyone who cared about the common good. The Jews understood this, and they feared Capistrano; they tried to bribe him without success.

To stigmatize Capistrano as a Jew-hater because he insisted laws be enforced is a deliberate misrepresentation of the social facts of his era. Jewish involvement in usury caused problems—not least of all for the Jews—throughout the Middle Ages. "The question of Jewish privileges cannot be regarded as a war of medieval intolerance against the approaching dawn of noble humanitarianism."[210] Capistrano's contemporaries understood that, and the idea "That in dealing with heretics and Jews he transgressed established bounds and thereby failed against Christian charity is a thought practically unknown to contemporaries. He was at times censured as impractical, but never as uncharitable or inhuman. Even Doering, one of his severest critics, finds nothing to blame in Capistrano's behavior toward the Jews in Breslau."[211]

Chapter Seven

The Converso Problem

Revenue to the crown of Aragon dropped catastrophically as a consequence of the conversion of the Sephardic Jews. The Jews who submitted to baptism were no longer subject to the head tax. They were also, as Christians, qualified for governmental office. Race was not an issue. "[T]he Jew who became a Christian was eligible to any position in Church or State or to any matrimonial alliance for which his abilities fitted him."[1] The converted Jews flourished, leading the nation in its return to "normalcy." When the king of Aragon admitted officially that many conversions were forced, and therefore unacceptable, and allowed Jews to return to Judaism if they wished, the resulting laxity, prosperity, lack of catechesis, and general lethargy combined to call commitment to the faith into question. Because the Jews' way of life often didn't change much after conversion, the lines between Christians and Jews blurred in doctrinally and socially dangerous ways. The Infante Don Alfonso summarized the situation when criticizing "conversions [which] resulted from overt pressure and coercion."[2] Forced conversions are not

> deeds pleasing in the sight of God, for He desires voluntary and not compulsory sacrifices. Moreover, experience has shown that, contrary to expectations, the recent converts to the holy Catholic faith still continue most meticulously and reverently—even in an exaggerated form—in their perversities and faith in the false religion in which they believed before the illumination of the Holy Ghost came upon them. I can testify that I have observed this in my own private concerns and at my court.[3]

The very openness of Spanish society, though favorable in the short run, was ultimately detrimental to the status of the converted Jews. Diego de Valera, a converso, wrote "there was great enmity and rivalry" on the Cordoba city council, because "the New Christians were very rich and kept buying public offices, which they made use of so arrogantly that the Old Christians would not put up with it."[4] The conversos often worked at the royal courts because their religion was no longer an impediment to putting their abilities to use as civil servants. In 1415 Juan II of Castile informed his converso treasurer,

"Whereas I have been informed that members of your family were, when Jews, considered to be noble, it is right that you should be held in even more honor now that you are Christians. Therefore it is my decision that you be treated as nobles."[5] The status of the Jews who converted in the wake of the riots of 1391 and the campaigns of Vincent Ferrer in the early 15th century has been disputed ever since. Cantor says

> not only were the great majority of Jewish converts sincere, but from among learned and aristocratic New Christian families came some of the greatest names in early 16th century Spanish ecclesiastical and cultural history: Juan Luis Vives, the Erasmian humanist, Bartolome de Las Casas, the apostle to the Native Americans and nemesis of the reckless conquistadors; St. Teresa of Avila, reformer of the Carmelite order, the first female doctor of the Church, and the teacher of St. John of the Cross; as well as some leading bishops of the time, such as Herdnand de Talavaro, the first bishop of Granada, formerly Queen Isabella's confessor.[6]

Cantor goes on to say:

> It is not an exaggeration to see the role of scions of converted Jewish families as central to the Spanish Renaissance of the early 16th century, as were Jews in the modernist cultural revolution of the early 20th century. In both cases complete access to general culture induced an explosion of intellectual creativity. The Jewish New Christians and their children in the early 16th century embraced Christian thought and learning with the same kind of creative enthusiasm as assimilated Jews contributed to modernism in literature and theory between 1900 and 1940.[7]

Cecil Roth says the opposite. Although "within a generation or two, the marranos became assimilated enough," Roth feels appearances were deceiving. Although "their worldly success was phenomenal," and "they almost controlled the economic life of the country" and "made fabulous fortunes as bankers and merchants," and "thronged the liberal professions," even attaining high rank in the Church, "the vast majority of the Conversos "remained faithful at heart to the religion of their fathers. . . . *Their Christianity was merely a mask*. . . They were Christians in nothing, and Jews in everything but name."8

Was the Christianity of the Catholic bishop Solomon Halevy merely a mask? That seems unlikely. The evidence for the sincerity of Jewish conversions comes largely from the biographies of eminent conversos. The evidence for insincerity comes largely from the documents of the Inquisition. Benzion Netanyahu resolves the dilemma by disqualifying all Inquisition documents as unreliable. "Most of the conversos," Netanyahu tells us,

> were conscious assimilationists who wished to merge with the Christian society, educate their children as fully fledged Christians and remove themselves from anything regarded as Jewish, especially in the field of religion. . . . the number of the Christianized Marranos was rising from

> generation to generation, while the number of clandestine Jews among them was rapidly dwindling to the vanishing point. In 1481, when the Inquisition was established, the Judaizers formed a small minority in both relative and absolute numbers. . . . Surely there was no need to eliminate by force a phenomenon that was disappearing by itself.[9]

Netanyahu claims scholars felt the conversos were secret Jews only because of "the reliance of most scholars on the documents of the Inquisition."[10] To get an accurate picture of mid-15th century Spain, evidence "must be obtained from sources that were absolutely free of the Inquisition's influence."[11] Evidence needs to be gleaned from "documents that antedated the Inquisition."[12] Those documents, Netanyahu says, show "virtually all Jewish authorities in Spain and elsewhere regarded the mass of the marranos as renegades—that is, as apostates or gentiles. By any of these definitions, these were Christians, and in no way Judaizers or crypto-Jews. . . . Had the marranos been secret Jews, the Jewish scholars and leaders who authored our sources would have been the first to confirm this fact. . . . The evidence of the Jewish sources, therefore, flatly contradicted the Inquisitional charges. Its lesson was that the New Christians were generally what their name suggested."[13]

Netanyahu thus begins to solve the problem of whether the converts were sincere, but raises another even more intractable problem. If the Jews were sincere, why did the turmoil the conversions were supposed to solve continue? If the conversions were sincere, why didn't peace return to Spain? Netanyahu's answer to that question is anti-Semitism. But, as of 1391, anti-Semitism did not exist. Animus against Jews was based purely on religious grounds. Baptism, as St. Vincent Ferrer pointed out, destroyed the Jew. There was no Jew left after conversion. According to principles that the popes reiterated repeatedly, converts were to be accepted without calumny. Why, then, was there a problem? Netanyahu's answer: the Spaniards hated the Jews and looked for any reason to discriminate against them, even after conversion. According to Netanyahu, the bishops were not interested in "true conversion or religious probity. . . . What they wanted was to have the Jews degraded and repressed."[14] Netanyahu claims the Spanish bishops "did not want to have all of Spain's Jews converted and fused with the Spaniards."[15] But this is precisely what happened in case after prominent case! The conversion of Solomon Halevy is one example of a Jewish convert who was accepted unequivocally by both the Church and State. There is no evidence of any reluctance of the Spanish hierarchy to accept him as a fellow bishop in good standing. Torquemada, the Grand Inquisitor, came from a converso family. Ignoring these and other salient facts, Netanyahu claims the bishops evaded a dilemma when "they formally recognized the forced converts as Christians, but in practice treated them all as Jews on the grounds that their conversion was forced."[16] There is no evidence to support this contention, and much to contradict it.

Netanyahu notes some bishops attempted to thwart the mass conversions, but refuses to accept the theological justification for their actions. Theological considerations distinguished the bishops from the politicians in Spain, the latter always more willing to use forced conversion as the simplest solution to intractable conflicts. Forced conversion was not new to Spain, nor were its *sequelae*. In 633 the Fourth Council of Toledo decreed "Very many of the Jews who, some time ago, were promoted to the Christian faith, are now not only known to blaspheme Christ and perform Jewish rites, they are also presumed to practice the abominable circumcisions."[17]

After admitting "the Church often curbed the kings' zeal" and the bishops "at least to some extent, championed freedom of conscience,"[18] Netanyahu is forced to question their motives. The more Netanyahu develops his thesis the more he gets caught in the hermeneutic of his own suspicion. The bishops, he says, "hid their real motives when they attributed the slowness of their action to their attempts to convert the Jews by preaching."[19] How does he know this? In opposing forced conversion, the Spanish bishops were only reiterating the constant teaching of the Church. No hidden motives were necessary to justify their position. Netanyahu gives no evidence for his assessment of their motives. Instead, he makes apodictic statements: "No one knew better than the Spanish bishops that they could not count on mere preaching and persuasion to convert Spain's Jews to Christianity. Hence, their policy on the issue of conversion was rooted in different considerations."[20] Netanyahu thus contradicts his original premise that the conversions were sincere. The crusade of Vincent Ferrer shows that preaching and persuasion led to the conversion of many Jews. The same is true of the Disputation of Tortosa, which even Jewish sources admit. Netanyahu, as a result, is in a bind. If the conversions were insincere, then the documents of the Inquisition are worth examining. If the conversions were sincere, then they were not brought about by force, but by "preaching and persuasion." Netanyahu seems unaware of the contradiction at the heart of his book, a contradiction required by the unquestioned tenet of mainstream Jewish historiography, namely, that anti-Semitism is never a function of Jewish behavior.

Conspicuous by its absence from Netanyahu's book is any consideration of rabbinic theology on the issue of conversion under duress. The rabbis played into the hands of racists when they collaborated with unscrupulous Spanish politicians to allow false conversion. The early Church was split over whether Christians who renounced the faith during the Roman persecutions should be readmitted to the Church. The less rigid debated which penances should apply, but the Church never condoned renunciation of the faith. Talmudic Judaism, however, accommodated lying (if not in all cases of apostasy) based on a distinction that would have consequences as serious as those that followed from the forced conversions. In the 15th century, the rabbis in North Africa distinguished between *anusim*, or unwilling converts, and *meshumadim*, those

who converted voluntarily. The only Jew ostracized by the synagogue was the sincere convert. The liar and dissembler were tolerated tacitly, in violation of the teaching of Moses and the scriptural principle articulated in the Book of Maccabees. As a result, the rabbis and unscrupulous anti-Semitic Christian politicians collaborated in creating an atmosphere where subversion flourished. Jews who prospered by converting could continue to prosper as Christians while retaining the same opportunistic attitude toward Christianity that had prevented them from dying for Judaism. The Christians who had been moved to violence against Jews now harbored the same animus, clouded by religious ambiguity, against the conversos, whom they called marranos, a derogatory term, which some claim means swine. Race replaced religion as the source of the animosity, but now there was no instant theological cure, i.e., baptism, for being of the wrong race. There was, in fact, no cure other than extermination or expulsion.

Forced conversion strengthened the suspicions it was supposed to allay, and turned a difficult issue into an impossible one. And the rabbis were instrumental in strengthening the suspicions of the racially minded. Jews were regarded as a fifth column within the state, and conversos were regarded, because of the very conversion that was forced on them, as an even more dangerous fifth column within the Church. Fray Vicente de Rocamora, the confessor of Empress Maria, sister of Philip II, "threw off the mask of Catholicism and joined the Hebrew community at Amsterdam as Isaac of Rocamora."[21] In the 17th century, the Jewish community at Amsterdam consisted almost exclusively of conversos who had thrown off the Catholic faith after escaping from Spain and Portugal. It was made up, in other words, of apostate Catholics who had lied about their faith.

The cynical Jews who converted insincerely exploited the system of forced conversion to retain power and wealth: consequently those whose conversions were sincere suffered under the growing anti-Semitism. Later Jewish apologists seem unaware of the complexity of the situation and the implications that flow from it.

Roth's description of the conversos as "Christians in nothing, and Jews in everything but name" probably described some but not all Jews who converted after the uprising of 1391. He fails to see that justifying false conversion lends credence to the anti-Semites. First, it ignores the many sincere conversions. Roth and the Spanish anti-Semites dismiss the possibility of sincere conversion out of hand. Second, Roth's justification of duplicity condones subversion and makes it a Jewish characteristic. In this, Roth is following weighty rabbinic opinion, which accepted outward conversion if coupled with an inward denial. The rabbinic acceptance of duplicity would have far-reaching consequences for European Jewry.

The regimen of false conversions in Spain made a bad situation worse. The cynical Jewish converts continued to exploit the situation under the protection

of the Church, while the sincere Jewish converts lived under constant and intolerable suspicion. By the 1440s, it was clear that forced conversions had not solved Spain's Jewish problem. According to the Acts of the financial administration of Castile

> Jews controlled about two-thirds of the indirect taxes and customs within the country, on the frontier and at the ports. Occasionally, in conjunction with tax-farming, Jews also engaged in purveying grain, arms and clothing for the army that was then fighting with the Moslems. A whole network of Jewish tax-farmers and collectors was spread over the entire kingdom. Their chief was a Jewish tax-farmer general, who also acted as the king's treasurer.[22]

The old animosities returned more virulently. A Jewish tax-collector was killed. On Jewish festivals, conversos "visited their Jewish friends at the synagogue and in the succah."[23] The *lingua franca* of both groups became a rationalist "Averroism," according to which it was "common practice for both converso and Jewish intellectuals to compare the laws of the Torah to natural morality and natural law" and assert that Aristotle's *Ethics* was a "sufficient" guide for Christian conduct.[24] "The wholesale conversions," says Walsh,

> seemed to have given to this opportunist type of Jew a chance to eat his cake and have it too. He could enjoy all the advantages of going to Mass on Sunday, and going to the Synagogue on Saturday. His children were barred from no profitable and honorable occupations. They could marry, thanks to his money, into noble impoverished families, and succeed to the proudest titles in Castile. They could become priests, even bishops. There was Andres Gomalz, parish priest of San Martin de Talavera, who, according to his own confession, celebrated Mass from 1472 to 1486 without believing in it.[25]

Baer, writing from the Jewish perspective, concurs. The fervor of conversion from 1391 to 1414 was followed by reaction, during which the conversos returned *ad vomitum Iudaismi*. Baer sees a conscious return to Jewish roots rather than cultural inertia or opportunism: "Not only did actual converts (anusim) try with all their might to live as Jews, but even the children and the grandchildren of apostates who had forsaken Judaism of their own free will and choice were now inclined to retrace their steps. The conversos secretly visited their Jewish brethren in order to join them in celebrating the Jewish festivals."[26] Baer says the conversos "had Jewish prayer books and engaged their own Hebrew teachers and ritual slaughters."[27]

The conversos continued to earn the odium of the Christian majority because many lent money at interest and tax-farmed. The efficacy of baptism, and therefore, the sacramental system of the Church, was called into question, something that led inexorably to racism. Or fear was suppressed and then transformed into hatred of the Jews, who were seen as trifling mendaciously

with the most sacred commitments, and therefore incapable of being trusted. The suspicions fell most heavily on the cultured conversos of the upper class who benefited most from conversion by gaining access to offices previously off-limits to Jews. The average Christian believed he was ruled by a class of philosophical intellectuals who were nihilists and opportunists with no religious beliefs. Baer cites the saying, "to be born and die; all the rest is a snare and a delusion," as epitomizing the beliefs of this class of convert.[28] Because of the large number of converted Jews prominent in Spain, it was reputedly more secular than renaissance Italy. "Lyric poetry from the period reveals, as it did in the 12th and 13th centuries, a type of Jewish courtier who had become either a converso or an open apostate." The Italians felt the Jews ruled Spain, "while secretly perverting the faith by their covert adherence to Judaism."[29]

During the posthumous trial of Pedro de la Cavalleria, killed in 1461 in an uprising in Catalonia against John II of Aragon, a Jewish weaver testified that de la Cavalleria had lived near his home in a small village in Aragon to escape the plague. While there, de la Cavalleria often visited the weaver and took part in the Sabbath meal, eating hamin and other foods. When the tailor noticed how well versed de la Cavalleria was in Hebrew prayers, he asked him, why, "being so learned in the Torah," he had converted to Christianity. De la Cavalleria replied:

> Silence, fool! Could I, as a Jew, ever have risen higher than a rabbinical post? But now, see, I am one of the chief councilors (jurado) of the city. For the sake of the little man who was hanged (Jesus), I am accorded every honor, and I issue orders and decrees to the whole city of Saragossa. Who hinders me—if I choose—from fasting on Yom Kippur and keeping your festivals and all the rest? When I was a Jew I dared not walk as far as this (i.e., beyond the prescribed limits of a Sabbath day's walk) but now I do as I please.[30]

Baer concludes "Testimony as detailed can hardly be doubted."[31] Conversos could have the best of both worlds. They could advance in careers formerly barred to them, and they could continue to lend money and tax farm, without the heavy burden of the Jewish law or the equally heavily burden of taxation levied on the Jews. They had the freedom of the Gospels from the Jewish law, and they had the freedom of the Jews from Christian responsibility. No one was able to enforce either set of rules on them.

This triumph was short-lived. Their success shows there had been no antagonism of race but only of religion. That changed speedily. As apostate Jews, in many cases, they lavished hate and contempt on those who remained Jews. It proved impossible to stimulate popular abhorrence of the Jew without also stimulating the envy and jealousy excited by the ostentation and arrogance

of the New Christians. Morals deteriorated at the court, and the peasants groaned under their predations. "This situation," Walsh says,

> could not go on indefinitely without an explosion, and unfortunately there were many explosions of the worst possible sort. The mob, seeing the government of Enrique el Impotente unwilling to do anything to curb the conversos, and virtually handing over to them the conduct of both State and Church, took matters into their own hands. In one city after another, just before Queen Isabel came to the throne, the conversos were put to the sword and their houses burned.[32]

The explosion occurred in Toledo in 1449, when Alvaro de Luna demanded the city pay for the defense of the frontiers. When the city refused, Alvaro ordered his tax-farmers, most of whom were conversos, to collect. The population rose in rebellion and burned the house of a prominent converso tax-farmer to the ground. The mob then turned on the houses of Toledo's other conversos and burned them to the ground too. It was the first racially based pogrom in the history of Christendom; it marked the entry of racism into European history: "the hatred which of old had been merely a matter of religion had become a matter of race. The one could be conjured away by baptism; the other was indelible and the change was of the most serious import, exercising for centuries its sinister influence on the fate of the Peninsula."[33]

State and Church responded promptly. The old Christians held the conversos responsible for the uprising. Pedro Sarmiento had conversos tortured; they confessed they had been living as Jews. He sentenced them to burn at the stake and issued an edict accusing them of perfidy. The conversos, the edict claimed, had been behind Don Alvaro's ruinous levy, which was tantamount to an act of war. The conversos, further, had plundered the royal treasury "by stratagems and cunning," which had impoverished the ancient nobility, depriving them of their fortunes, rights and privileges. Sarmiento then "proclaimed all conversos of Jewish descent to be unfit for any public office whose occupants exercise authority over Old Christians in the city and the district."[34]

On September 24, 1449, Pope Nicholas V issued a bull declaring that the faithful were one and that racial distinctions had no standing in the Catholic Church. He ordered the king to enforce the laws of Alfonzo X to this effect. Converts to the Catholic faith were to be accepted without calumny. Alonso de Oropesa, General of the Geronimites, wrote *Lumen ad Revelationem Gentium*, supporting the pope's pronouncement that the Church was one. He also laid out a program of reform to deal with the converso issue, but the feuding between old and new Christians continued unabated.

The grievances of the old Christians can be gleaned from a satire written around this time. A parody of a royal document, it purports to confer privileges

on a knight of old Christian descent to henceforth live like a Marrano. He could now advise the country's rulers

> and by his wicked counsel to lead them into the paths of licentiousness, lust and oppression of their poor subjects and to derive from all this the utmost possible advantages for himself. He was entitled. . . to charge interest on loans, to keep the Jewish laws, to intermarry with members of the Jewish race, to hold their opinions, and to believe not in the Catholic faith but solely in birth and death.[35]

He was also granted permission

> to swindle old Christians and set them to murdering one another. He was also free to become a priest for the purpose of listening to the confessions of old Christians and to pry into their secrets. He and his posterity were permitted to become physicians and surgeons so as to kill old Christians, take away their wives, defile their pure blood and occupy their posts.[36]

The satire parodies the greed of the conversos, granting the old Christian the right to carry "tax-farming registers in place of prayer books" when attending Church services, "as many of the marranos were in the habit of doing." Christian knights were "to be called by Jewish names in private and Christian names in public so as to deceive the people."[37] Baer claims this satire marks the entry of racism into European life "because in it we find for the first time the favorite racial adage: that the pure blood of Spanish Christians was defiled when mixed with that of persons of the Jewish race."[38] Racism was deeply subversive of the Catholic faith thereafter throughout European history until the Nazi genocide, because it cast doubt on the efficacy of the sacraments, and, consequently, on the power of Christ and his Church. The Spaniards who had the misfortune to live under weak kings like Henry the Impotent "had learned from experience that a man's characteristics and beliefs were not changed by baptism, despite its 'ineffaceable character.'"[39] All conversos were now suspect; and Jews could use these suspicions to cast doubts on the successful efforts of Vincent Ferrer, Pablo Santa Maria, and Geronimo de Sancte Fide.

King John II of Castile responded to the crisis in Toledo by siding with the pope and punishing Sarmiento and the old Christians, whose anti-converso decrees were revoked. Sarmiento fled for his life. Two years later, Nicholas V bowed to political necessity when John II asked him for the authority to establish the Inquisition to try conversos suspected of practicing Judaism in secret. The nobles of the realm, however, continued to exert pressure from the opposite direction. They wanted repressive laws revoked so they could attract Jews into their service. When they were not revoked, the nobles ignored them and favored Jews for financial reasons. To fulfill the pecuniary expectations of the princes, the Jews reverted to grinding the Christian majority, a practice that further inflamed already white-hot resentment. The nobles and districts

that followed the law were, in effect, punished financially for doing so, which led the Cortes of 1462 to ask Henry to rescind the offending laws and restore liberty of trade between Christian and Jew.

Henry the Impotent's inability to control the situation resulted in 20 years of increasing anarchy, leading eventually to civil war. Both Jew and Christian, old and new, were to learn that tolerance was another word for chaos. The Judaizers maintained the upper hand in government because the ruler was too weak to rein them in, but the inactivity of the princes only led to the increased activity of the prelates, who complained loudly because the prince handed his realm over to exploiters.

Six years into Henry's reign, Alfonso de Espina, a Franciscan monk, published one of the most virulent attacks on the Jews to date, *Fortalitium Fidei* (Fortress of Faith). Espina was the confessor to Henry IV and a Jewish convert himself, so once again the old pattern reasserted itself. His book and sermons followed in the footsteps of Martini's *Pugio Fidei*, but his ire focused on the conversos. The situation was as confusing as it was dangerous. In his diatribe, Espina "suggested that if an Inquisition were established in Castile, large numbers of them would be found to be only pretending Christians, engaged in judaizing and in undermining the Faith they professed."[40] Something had to be done to end the confusion, under whose cover "The judges of the people" were "being seduced by the bribes they receive from the cruel Jews who blaspheme God." Everyone pursued his gain at the expense of everyone else, but "No man takes up the cudgels for abject Spain."[41]

The complaints of the old Christians against "the religious misconduct of the conversos, who were never punished" were not exaggerated, according to Espina. They were "well-grounded."[42] When the crown did nothing, "the embittered populace rose up and took vengeance upon the conversos on their own initiative."[43] Oropesa, who proposed a more moderate course than Espina, concurred and "suggested that the king put an end to this state of anarchy by means of suitable regulations." The radical Espina and the moderate Oropesa, who defended the conversos, thought some judicial body was necessary to pursue the rumors of judaizing and either lay them to rest as fictions or establish them as fact and prosecute the guilty. Even Oropesa reproved the government for handing its reins to the Jews. His strategy was to divide the conversos from the Jews and to lead the converso to a stronger, deeper faith through Christian charity. Unfortunately, the opposite happened, but both voices were instrumental in forming the consensus that established the Inquisition in Spain.

In 1453, after Constantinople fell to the Turks, the Christians feared a resurgence of Muslim influence in Spain, thwarting the *Reconquista*. The Jews were seized again with messianic fervor, much of it described in Espina's *Fortalitium Fidei*. The arrival of the messiah was imminent once again, even if "None could see the messiah except circumcised Jews; if any non-Jews looked

at him, he would blind them forthwith by his dazzling radiance."[44] In 1464, large numbers of conversos sailed for Constantinople, where they intended to revert to the religion of their fathers and give aid to the Turk Antichrist, who planned to march on Christian Europe and subdue it as the Moors had subdued Spain in the 8th century.

During the 1460s, many Jews who fled persecution in Castile settled in Aragon, where lax conditions led to a fairly open practice of Judaism by the conversos. One refugee was Juan de Ciudad, who presented himself at the home of Rabbi Abraham Bivach for circumcision. After a rite which removed, according to rabbinic theory, the stain of baptism, Juan de Ciudad set off for the Holy Land, presumably to practice his religion and give whatever aid he could to the Turkish Antichrist. Baer summarizes the conditions then extant in Aragon: "Only religious laxity, toleration and the state of war then prevailing in the Kingdom of Aragon can explain the fact that such actions could take place almost publicly, and that the circumcised men could go their way unhindered."[45]

In 1465, Oropesa led a delegation of Christian nobles who petitioned the king of Castile to enforce the laws against Jews and Muslims; high on the list was a request to enforce anti-usury laws, an indication the issue of usury was still intractable. Henry, however, was in no position to enforce anything. His kingdom was in anarchy, which soon descended into civil war, even though he was no longer king. Later in 1465, his brother Alfonso deposed Henry IV. Alfonso ascended the throne of Castile in 1467. When Alfonso entered Toledo in May of that year, open warfare broke out between the old Christians and the conversos. On July 2, a battle began which raged in Toledo for three days, during which four streets inhabited exclusively by conversos went up in flames. "Many of the conversos who fought in these battles," says Baer, "were undoubtedly involuntary converts who practiced the Jewish rites and believed in the torah—a fact confirmed by the records of the Inquisition in the middle and late 1480s."[46]

In 1469 Dona Isabella of Castile married Don Fernando, son of John II of Aragon. Ferdinand and Isabella tried to resolve the civil war that raged throughout Spain. The Jews were initially well-disposed to the marriage. Pedro de la Cavalleria had brought the pearl collar that served as the equivalent of an engagement ring to Castile. The Jews felt that a strong regime that maintained law and order would benefit them. But, at least initially, Ferdinand and Isabella proved incapable of ending the civil war.

In March 1473, violence and racial hatred broke out again with renewed fury. During the conflicts of 1473, the Inquisition tried conversos in Cordova and Ciudad Real. On December 10, 1474, Henry IV died, bequeathing his kingdom and its problems to the young married couple, who began to accept a nation-wide introduction of the Inquisition as the only way to restore law and order to the realm. The only thing that united Spain was the demand

for resolution of the crisis. Anton de Montora, a converso from Cordova, wrote a poem upon their accession which describes the plight of his co-religionists, "innocent people whose faith," he claims, was "as orthodox as the sovereigns."[47] The mendicant friars, though, continued to preach sermon after sermon against Judaism and the Judaizers, urging the faithful to take matters into their own hands.

There was also the matter of the Moors, who still occupied southern Spain, and who were suspected of being in league with the Jews. And there were also the recalcitrant nobles, who were a law unto themselves, pillaging and plundering at will. Isabella needed to reimpose law on her kingdom, but she also realized that military conquest was necessary before that could happen.

After victory at Toro in 1476 over the party of "L'a Beltraneja," Henry's putative daughter whom the Portuguese backed as claimant to the throne, the Cortes of Madrigal restored royal prerogatives. Jews were even more beyond the law than the renegade nobles. They were tried in their own courts. They could be prosecuted in royal courts for criminal offenses, but they could only be punished in accord with their own law. They could not be summoned to court on the Sabbath. Even polygamy was tolerated among the Jews, and so they became an ongoing incitement for contempt of the law and of the Christian faith. The conversos quickly exploited the situation. The Cura de los Palacios claimed the practice of Judaism was widespread among the conversos. Lea claims that when the royal couple took the throne, the Judaizers were so powerful that "the clerks were on the point of preaching the law of Moses."[48] In addition, the judaizing conversos "avoided baptizing their children, and, when they could not prevent it they washed off the baptism on returning from the church; they ate meat on fast days and unleavened bread at Passover."[49] They also continued to benefit from usury, claiming "they were despoiling the Egyptians."[50] As a result, they became wealthy and powerful enough to block the enforcement of the laws that would have restored order. Anarchy thwarted the attempt to impose order.

In July 1477, Isabella came to Seville. During her stay, which lasted until October 1478, she was subjected to the sermons of Fray Alfonso de Hojeda, the Dominican prior of Seville, who "devoted all his energies to making the crown aware of the reality of the danger from Jews and false converts."[51] Hojeda convinced Isabella that her own court was infested with conversos, whose insincerity was incontestable; that, according to principles universally accepted, it was the sovereign's duty to restore the unity of faith; and, that the instrument to do this was the Inquisition, a juridical body that had proven its worth dealing with the Albigensian heretics two centuries previously.

Isabella was convinced radical measures were necessary. The report of Hojeda and the Bishop of Cadiz convinced her nearly all converts were secretly practicing Judaism. They convinced her as well that priests of Jewish descent were "on the point of preaching the Law of Moses from Catholic pulpits."[52]

Logic dictated that she could not rely on her courts because they were staffed by conversos. The only suitable instrument was the Inquisition, a legal body whose judges would be Dominican monks, "carefully chosen and beyond the reach of intimidation or bribery."[53]

In 1478 she sent a delegation to Pope Sixtus IV to procure the necessary bull. Less than two years later, Mohammed II, head of the newly vitalized Turkish forces in the former capital of the eastern Roman empire, ravaged the coast of Apulia in anger after failing to take the island of Rhodes. On August 11, 1480, Mohammed took Otranto in Apulia, and immediately put half of the population to the sword. The archbishop and his clergy were slaughtered after being tortured. When the news arrived in Spain in mid-September, the threat of the resurgent Turk convinced Ferdinand and Isabella they could no longer vacillate. They put into immediate effect the powers Sixtus had granted them two years earlier. The Spanish Inquisition came into existence when Ferdinand and Isabella were dealing with long-standing and seemingly intractable civil war and anarchy. Additionally, they declared war on the Muslim kingdom of Grenada in 1482. The creation of the Inquistion is an indication they saw Jews and Judaizers as central to both the Muslim problem in the territory yet to be conquered and the problem of anarchy in areas under their control.

On September 17, 1480, Juan de San Martin, bachelor of theology and friar of San Pablo in Seville, and Miguel de Morillo, master of theology, were appointed grand inquisitors, with Juan Ruiz de Medina as their advisor. Tomas Torquemada was brought in as a consulting expert; quite possibly, according to Walsh, "he had beside him, for reference, a copy of Eymeric's *Directorium*, borrowed from some Dominican convent in Aragon or Languedoc."[54] The friars were solemnly informed that any dereliction of duty would lead to their removal, with "forfeiture of all their temporalities and denaturalization in the kingdom."[55] By royal order, they received free transportation to Seville, the town where the judaizing heretics were most flagrantly and deeply rooted. In Seville, the Inquisition began its work.

The question of the sincerity of the conversos has been debated continually. The rabbis of North Africa were unequivocal. If the conversions were real and voluntary, converts were called *meshumadim*; unwilling converts were known as *anusim*. There was ample evidence "the conversos continued living in some measure as Jews, but with the advantage now of enjoying rights accorded to Christians."[56] In Mallorca, a rabbi commented, the authorities "are lenient with the conversos and allow them to do as they will." Many modern writers, in no way anti-Semitic, consistently identify the conversos as Jews. An influential school in modern Jewish historiography has likewise ironically insisted the Inquisition was right, all conversos were aspiring Jews. Yitzhak Baer states uncompromisingly "the conversos and Jews were one people, united by destiny."[57]

The simplest way to resolve the conflict is to conclude that both sides were right. From the Christian perspective, many conversos were virtually practicing Jews. They remained Christians voluntarily, but "it was their voluntary Christianity which marked them in Jewish eyes as renegades, meshumadim."[58] Once the crown in collaboration with the Church enforced orthodoxy on the conversos, many regretted their conversions. A Jewish doctor in Soria in 1491 recalled an old converso who "told him, weeping how much he repented having turned Christian. Speaking of another converso, the doctor said "he believed in neither the Christian nor the Jewish faith."[59]

There also was confusion due to cultural inertia, which may or may not have been innocent theologically. The Old Christians noticed "vestigial Jewish practices in matters of family habits and cuisine, residual Jewish culture in vocabulary, kinship links between Jews and conversos. These remnants were identifiably Jewish."[60] Many commentators maintain such cultural behavior did not constitute "evidence of judaizing." The same commentators argue the

> converso danger . . . was invented to justify spoliation of conversos. The harvest of heretics reaped by the early Inquisition owed its success to deliberate falsification or to the completely indiscriminate way in which residual Jewish customs were interpreted as being heretical. Though it can certainly be identified in the period after the forced conversions of 1492, there was no systematic "converso religion" in the 1480s to justify the creation of an Inquisition. Much of the evidence for judaizing was thin, if not false.[61]

On the other hand, the reaction to the arrival of the Inquisition in Seville indicates that more than dietary issues were at stake. Diego de Susan, a Seville rabbi who had amassed a fortune, delivered a fiery speech urging Jews and conversos to "recruit faithful men, collect a store of arms, and that the first arrest by the Inquistors should be the signal of a rising in which the inquisitors should be slain and thus an emphatic warning be given to deter others from renewing the attempt."[62] Susan's daughter, "whose loveliness had won for her the name of Fermosa Fembra,"[63] revealed the details of the intrigue to her lover, who informed the Inquisition the plot was afoot. When Susan was arrested, panic seized the conversos and many fled, some to Rome.

When the first *auto da fe* was celebrated in Seville, on February 6, 1481, Diego de Susan was one of six burned at the stake. Bernaldez, who was in Seville then, claimed the rabbi died as a Christian. Seven hundred conversos accused by the Inquisition of heresy in Seville in 1481 abjured and were reconciled to the church. "There was no longer any doubt in the minds of the secret Jews that the Queen was as earnest about this affair as she had been about the murders and lootings she had punished."[64] As a result, panic spread through Spain and resistance to government authority ceased. The Inquisition claimed the lives of three of the wealthiest and most important citizens of

Seville, including Susan. Fray Alonso de Hojeda preached the sermon at the ceremony; he too died a few days later, from the plague, which claimed 15,000 people in Seville.

The Inquisition began with an Edict of Grace, during which those suspected of judaizing had time to come forward, confess their sins, be absolved, and then reconcile to the Church after performing suitable penance. The Inquisition insisted on capital punishment only if the heretic refused to recant or if he were caught at least three times in backsliding, an indication of bad faith and duplicity. Walsh insists "never in its entire history" did the Holy Office

> proceed against the Jews, either on racial grounds as Jews, or on religious grounds as members of the synagogue. Far from attacking the Law of Moses, it defended that revelation against certain sects of heretics, as an essential part of Catholic truth. Over the Jew as Jew it claimed no jurisdiction. It was a Christian tribunal, which concerned itself with Jews only when they were Christians, or when they went out of their way to commit offenses against Christians, either by deriding Christian beliefs or ceremonies, or by persuading Christians to give up the Faith.[65]

Walsh claims the Jews actively sought to bring conversos back to Judaism, and the fact that Jews

> scattered throughout Christendom carried on a continuous and effective propaganda which, while it persisted, was bound to make impossible the complete Christianizing of society, is freely admitted by Jewish scholars, as I have taken note elsewhere. "As a whole," says I. Abrahams, "heresy was a reversion to Old Testament and even Jewish ideals. It is indubitable that the heretical doctrines of the southern French Albigenses in the beginning of the thirteenth-century, as of the Hussites in the Fifteenth, were largely the result of friendly intercourse between Christians and Jews."[66]

The Jews, as the disputations over the Talmud showed, were no longer following the law of Moses. The Talmud had absorbed the Torah and turned the Jews into a permanent fifth column in Christian culture, agitating for revolution when they were powerful enough or for subversion when they were not. "If the Jews had confined their activities to the synagogue and their allegiance to the Law of Moses," Walsh says, "a great deal of conflict and even bloodshed might have been avoided. Unfortunately, during their dispersion, under all the incredible sufferings and affronts they endured in country after country, they supplemented the revealed teachings of the Torah with others which, judging by their fruits, had a source quite other than the tables of Mount Sinai."[67] If Judaism could not survive without the Talmud, as the Jews maintained in France when it was taken away by Louis IX, then the Jews were involved in perpetual war against Christendom, because "the Jews included in

the Talmud and Talmudic books many obscene and blasphemous anecdotes concerning Christ and His Church, together with curses and imprecations against Christians, and bits of practical advice for outwitting and exploiting them."[68] Jewish denial only made their stance seem more subversive.

Once the true nature of Judaism became clear in the 13th century, both Church and State had a duty to make war on it, in some way. The only question was what kind of war. Saints like Vincent Ferrer, who felt that the only legitimate way to destroy an enemy was by making him into a friend, answered that question. Jews were subjected to persuasion as the prelude to conversion. Once the Jewish penchant for subversion and revolution became bound up with Spain's struggle with the Moors and its very existence as a nation, the spiritual program was politicized and physical force took the place of spiritual suasion. That paved the way for the ascendancy of another type of Jew, the opportunist, who was "compelled, at the sword's point, or under the sickening fear of social and economic ostracization, to accept baptism" and who would wreak havoc for centuries to come.[69] Wicked Christians wrongly forced Jews to the baptismal font, but it was also wrong of the Jews to convert under duress to a religion they believed false. Their acceptance of forced conversion deepened the Jewish commitment to subversion and revolution when the self-loathing became common and psychologically intolerable. Unlike the rabbis, the Catholic Church told its faithful to die as martyrs rather than accept Islam or any other false religion. The command was so absolute that when a Jew accepted the Catholic faith, he was presumed to have done so of his own free will. Any backsliding would be punished as heresy, especially since judaizing was one of the most common and recurrent heresies. Worse was promoting backsliding in others. If it was a capital crime to deprive a man of his life, was not deprivation of a man's spiritual life equally grave? The logic was extended to justify torture in the bull *Ad Extirpanda*: just "as thieves and robbers of temporal goods are forced to accuse their accomplices and to tell what crimes they have committed; for these are truly robbers and homicides of souls, and thieves of the sacraments of God, and of the Christian Faith."[70]

The logic of force eventually turned Vincent Ferrer's conversion campaign upside down. The Inquisition, especially in its more severe later stages, forced Jews and conversos to rethink their position. If the wave of conversions under Ferrer drove the Jews apart, the Inquisition drove them back together. If laws had given too much incentive for conversion, promoting opportunism for social and economic gain, the Inquisition, which punished only conversos, and which punished them more and more severely, provided incentives for reversion, for the Inquisition had no jurisdiction over Jews. "While the object of the Inquisition was to secure the unity of faith," Lea tells us, "its founding destroyed the hope that ultimately the Jews would be gathered into the fold of Christ. . . . the awful spectacle of the autos de fe and the miseries attendant

on wholesale confiscations led the Jew to cherish more resolutely than ever the ancestral faith which served him as a shield from the terrors of the Holy Office and the dreadful fate ever impending over the Conversos."[71] Kamen comments:

> The reign of terror had an inevitable consequence. Conversos ceased to come forward to admit their errors. Instead, they were forced to take refuge in the very beliefs and practices that they and their parents had turned their backs on. Active Judaism, which existed among some conversos, seems to have been caused primarily by the awakening of their consciousness under persecution. Under pressure, they reverted to the faith of their ancestors. A Jewish lady living in Siguenza was surprised in 1488 to encounter a man whom she had known previously in Valladolid as a Christian. He now professed to be a Jew, and was begging for charity among the Jews. "What are you doing over here?" she asked him. "The Inquisition is around and will burn you." He answered: "I want to go to Portugal.'" After no doubt equivocating for many years, he had made his decision and was going to risk all for it.[72]

In May 1482, the Edict of Grace was announced in Valencia. All who wished to confess their sins would be received in private. According to the Andalusian priest-historian Andres Bernaldez, "most of those who 'repented' and were 'reconciled' with the Church did so as a means of being able to practice the Jewish rites in secret, as they had previously done." According to Bernaldez "the confessions made by the conversos of Seville show that all of them were Jews; and from their statements a similar inference can be drawn in regard to the conversos of Cordova, Toledo, Burgos, Segovia, and all the rest of Spain."[73] All, continues Bernaldez, "were Jews and clung to their hope, like the Israelites in Egypt, who suffered many blows at the hands of the Egyptians and yet believed that God would lead them out from the midst of them as He did with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm. So, too, the conversos looked upon the Christians as Egyptians or worse."[74]

As the Inquisition spread through Spain, the severity of the punishments increased, while legal safeguards fell by the wayside. When many conversos escaped to Rome, the pope heard their story first hand. Sixtus IV concluded their complaints were well-founded and that his intervention was necessary. In early 1482, the pope informed the royal couple that the Inquisition had gone "far beyond what he had authorized."[75] In August 1483, he sent letters of absolution to the accused conversos.

In May, Ferdinand rebuked Rome, warning the pope not to interfere in what had become a state operation. The outcome would be satisfactory only if the king, who understood the situation in Spain much better than the pope, appointed the inquisitors. The king reminded the pope that the Inquisition had been ineffective in eradicating heresy when under papal control. The

Inquisition could only exist with power delegated from the pope, but once on Spanish soil, it became a function of the state. Ferdinand and Isabella jealously guarded their control over it, telling the pope to mind his own business.

In 1483, the conflict intensified. Despite the pope's letters of absolution, Seville expelled all Jews. "There can be no question," Baer tells us, "that the Inquisitors had the last word in deciding on the expulsion of the Jews from Andalusia."[76] At the end of that year, Tomas de Torquemada, the Dominican prior and confessor to the queen, was appointed grand inquisitor for all of Spain. The record of the Inquisition would prove erratic: "In some instances the tribunal proceeded in an orderly and moderate manner, while in others the methods employed were more like brutal assaults by soldiers than the conduct of a court of justice" with the latter approach becoming more prevalent over time. "Large commercial centers like Seville and Barcelona," Baer says, "were totally ruined by the Inquisition."[77]

Toward the end of 1483, the Inquisition arrived in Ciudad Real. Following the traditional Edict of Grace, the first *auto da fe* took place on November 16, 1483; many abjured, and no one was burned. However, in February 1484, 34 persons were burned at the stake, among them Maria Gonzales, who "at first denied that she was a Jewess at heart,"[78] but then confessed. Baer supports the judgment of the Inquisition: "Had she been allowed to live, she would certainly have been steadfast in her Jewish faith. This was true of most of the conversos of Ciudad Real."[79] In Guadalupe, a woman confessed she had eaten meat in her home on Good Friday. She also confessed "when her husband brought home a crucifix she trampled on it and threw it down the privy."[80] This woman admitted her guilt after her own daughter testified against her. Threatened with torture, she implicated others. The same Inquisition at Guadalupe revealed "conversos had been entering monasteries so as to be able to practice the Jewish Religion with greater safety."[81]

When the Inquisition arrived in Toledo in May 1485, the local conversos organized a revolt. The conspirators planned to assassinate the inquisitors "and the whole Christian population"[82] during the Corpus Christi processions, but the plot was discovered. The mayor of Toledo then had several conversos arrested and hanged. The Inquisition also brought out the worst in Jews, who used the trials to settle old scores. Many Jews were accused of bearing false witness against the conversos and sentenced to death by stoning. The first *auto da fe* in Toledo took place in February 1486, when 750 men and women from seven parishes were led through the streets and sentenced to various penances. In August, 27 conversos were burned at the stake. Between 1486 and 1490, 4,850 conversos were reconciled to the Church and 112 were burned at the stake. Baer says the number absolved far exceeded the number condemned because "the Christians of Toledo who demanded the utmost possible toleration of the conversos were very influential. . . . the clemency shown them can have been dictated only by political considerations. The conversos

wielded very considerable influence; they were an essential element of the population, and the confiscated part of their fortunes could be used without annihilating the conversos themselves."[83] According to Baer, "The conversos of Teruel doubtless deserved their 'ill repute' as Jews-in-fact." "It is obvious that alongside the Jewish community of Teruel, there was a community of conversos who assembled for public worship, Bible readings, and the like. Most of them were descendants of Jews converted during the years 1391-1415."[84]

In 1485, the Inquisition came to Saragossa, and, as in Seville and Toledo, the Judaizers and their supporters conspired to kill the Inquisitors and terrorize their potential successors into inactivity. The plot included a plan to drown the Inquisition's assessor as he walked beside the Ebro River, but the assessor never walked alone, so the plotters focused next on inquisitor Peter Arbues. The government knew something was afoot as early as January, but did nothing. Late in the evening of September 15, the conspirators attacked Arbues as he prayed in the cathedral. Arbues was aware of the threat to his life: he was wearing chain mail and a steel helmet; his spear was leaning against a nearby pillar. The mortally wounded Arbues prayed for 24 hours before dying on September 17. Miracles soon followed. The holy bell of Villela tolled of its own accord; the crowds mopped up his blood and worked wonders with it.

The consequences for the conversos were disastrous. The miracles attested to Arbues' sanctity, and the reaction to the murder broke the opposition to the Inquisition. In the revulsion against the murder, legal niceties were discarded, and the punishment and tortures knew no restraint. This murder turned the tide, which hitherto had been markedly hostile to the Inquisition. The news of the assassination spread through the city with marvelous rapidity and before dawn the streets were filled with excited crowds shouting, "Burn the conversos who have slain the Inquisitor." It was probably in consequence of the murder that Ferdinand and Isabella succeeded in obtaining from Innocent VIII papal letters of April 3, 1487, ordering all princes and rulers and magistrates to seize and deliver to the Inquisition of Spain all fugitives who should be designated to them, thus extending its arms everywhere throughout Christendom and practically outlawing all refugees.[85]

The murder of Peter Arbues "annihilated all opposition to the Inquisition for the next hundred years"[86] so effectively that some historians speculate the murder may have been arranged by the crown, although there is no evidence of this. No matter, the murder played into Ferdinand's hand in his attempt to end the chaos and defeat the Moors. In 1488 he issued instructions reforming the procedure of the Inquisitors. "Thus," Baer concludes, "the last and most daring attempt by the conversos to resist the Inquisition by force ended in failure."[87] Most of the murder suspects were conversos and/or others whose Jewish leanings were publicly known. In August 1487, the main conspirator, Jaime de Montesa, was executed after he confessed. He was a typical free-thinking Marrano skeptic, reported to have repeatedly quoted the saying, "In

this world you will not see me in trouble, and in another world you will not see me in torment."[88] After Montesa's death, more and more conversos were implicated in judaizing, including advisors to the royal couple. "In essence," Baer concludes, "the Inquisition was correct in its reading of the conversos' attitudes." Baer cites the *Coplas de Mingo Revulgo* of Diego Arias de Avila, in which conversos are portrayed as a group which "trample the Christians underfoot, and plunge them into debt and enslave them in all manner of servitude so that the Christians groan under so much robbery and spoliation." Torture played a role in these confessions.

The inquisitors usually proceeded with some respect for rules of law and justice, demonstrating facts that were unquestionably correct and refraining from malicious libels. In the fury following the murder of Peter Arbues, legal niceties fell by the wayside and the classical slanders—the Jews caused the plague, engaged in ritual sacrifice, etc.—made their way into the Inquisition's proceedings. In December, 1490, Yuce Franco was tried for attempting to bring conversos back to Judaism and for crucifying a Christian child on Good Friday. The conspirators allegedly were going to use the child's heart and a consecrated host in a magic spell to kill Christians by infecting them with rabies. Franco denied the charges. Torquemada removed him from the jurisdiction of the Inquisition and appointed special judges, leading Baer to conclude his goal was "the complete extermination of Spanish Jewry."[89]

When the victorious Spanish army marched into Malaga after the successful campaign to drive the Moors from Spain, they found 400 Jews living there. Virtually all were Judaized Christians who had fled the Inquisition from Spain to Granada, where they had reverted to Judaism. The apostates were ordered to decide whether they wanted to live completely as Christians or leave the country. Shortly after the royal couple entered Granada, they extended that option to all of Spain's Jews. On March 31, 1492, while still in Grenada, Ferdinand and Isabella signed the edict expelling the Jews from the kingdoms of Castile and Aragon. As before, Jews could convert and remain, but the Inquisition had removed much of the incentive to convert. Large numbers chose to leave. Their experience in Granada convinced the monarchs that a total separation was the only solution to their Jewish problem. By exporting a problem they could not solve, Ferdinand and Isabella saved Spain from the fate of Poland. Northern Europe, though, inherited Spain's problem, and cities like Antwerp became hotbeds of revolutionary activity.

The expulsion of the Jews and rabbinical justification for false conversion established the cultural matrix from which the revolutionary Jew emerged. If a Talmudic Jew could profess an idolatrous false religion in public and remain a Jew in good standing, then he simply could not be trusted, and the anti-Semites were right to view him as a dangerous subversive who threatened Church and State. Forced conversion was wrong, but the acceptance of it was also wrong. Worse still, acceptance of insincere conversion enshrined the

principle of deception and subversion as part of Jewish life. The Jew, according to the principles of the Old Testament from Moses to the Maccabees, had a duty to resist idolatry and incorporation into idolatrous religions to the point of death. The Talmudic teaching that condoned false conversion broke radically from Moses' teaching. The insincere Jewish converts to Christianity made subversion and deceit a way of life.

Converso behavior and worldview were similar to that of other disaffected European Catholics. The German monks who violated their vows of celibacy with impunity led double lives too; living a lie created animosity toward the institution to which they had made vows they would not fulfill. The first Lutherans and the first Calvinists were virtually indistinguishable from each other and from the conversos in theology and practice. Both movements drew their leadership from the sexually corrupt lower Catholic clergy. Calvin's lieutenant, the erstwhile Catholic, Theodore Beza was, says Walsh,

> a glaring example of the too-common corruption. Though not even a priest, he enjoys the incomes of two benefices, through political influence, lavishes the Church's money on his concubine, and generally leads a vicious and dissolute life. When the Church is under attack, he hastens to join the enemy. As Calvin's lieutenant, this righteous man thunders against the [corruption of the] Old Church, of which he was partly the cause.[90]

Beza's example was not uncommon. The monasteries of Europe were full of monks leading double lives. Spain was no exception:

> There is no doubt about the laxity of the monasteries of Seville and Valladolid, whose members embraced Protestantism; nor of the degeneracy of the Augustinians in Saxony, who broke away from the Church almost en masse in 1521. In England it was the reformed Observatine Franciscans who withstood Henry VIII even to death, while the relaxed Conventuals and other badly disciplined monks and priests formed the nucleus of the Church of England. The first Protestants, as a rule, were bad Catholics.[91]

The Spanish expulsions began in May, 1492. The Jews had to sell their property for a song, even though "instructions were issued to all the localities to pay the Jews all that was owed to them, and to enable them to pay their own debts and to dispose of their possessions on fair and equitable terms."[92] Torquemada forbade Christians from aiding the departing Jews after August 9. No Christian was allowed to communicate with the Jews or give them food or shelter. The Jews were not allowed to sell their synagogues; the property that they could sell was devalued because so many were selling to meet the explusion deadline imposed by the crown. Bernaldez chronicled the sufferings of the Jews; he also cites a converso woman from Almazan, who claimed years later "those who remained behind did so in order not to lose their property."[93]

In the fateful year 1492, Rodrigo Borgia ascended the papal throne and took the name Alexander VI. Pope Alexander contravened papal tradition by banning conversos from the Dominican order in Spain. In Rome he amended the proceedings of the Roman Carnival by extending the traditional footrace of the Roman Jews. But Jews could always expect a friendly reception in Rome and throughout the Papal States, and many Jews went there after the expulsion. Alexander did his part by hiring Jewish physicians.

The Inquisition and the expulsion undid the work of St. Vincent Ferrer. Jews were convinced conversion was or would be a mistake. After the Edict of Expulsion was announced, the clergy launched a conversion campaign, but the incentives were gone. There were few conversions, and most Jews left. Most went to Portugal, from whence they were expelled a few years later. Many went to Turkey, which received them with open arms. It was out of the Ladino community in Ismir that the false messiah Shabbetai Zevi would arise 150 years later, buoyed by the writings of the Lurianic Cabala, whose school had been established in Gaza as a result of the expulsions.

On July 31, 1492, the last Jew left Spain. In 1494, Alexander VI granted Ferdinand and Isabella the title of Catholic Kings, listing the expulsion of the Jews as one of their accomplishments. Gian Pico della Mirandola praised them for it too. Guicciardini, the Florentine historian and statesman, praised them as well. The expulsion of the Jews along with the defeat of the Moors had united Spain and "raised it to the rank of a great power." When Spain was in the hands of Jews and heretics it had been in anarchy. Guicciardini concluded "had the situation not been corrected, Spain would in a few years have forsaken the Catholic religion."[94]

Chapter Eight

Reuchlin v. Pfefferkorn

Roughly 270 years after Nicholas Donin persuaded Pope Gregory IX to allow him to proceed against the Talmud, another Jew converted to Christianity and had the same idea. In 1504, Josef Pfefferkorn, a Moravian Jew, converted to Christianity, along with his wife and child. After changing his name to Johannes at his baptism, Pfefferkorn spent his first years as a Christian wandering through southern German-speaking lands preaching the conversion of the Jews. In 1509 he settled in Cologne, where he made contact with the Dominicans, who had promoted Donin's efforts to convert the Jews three centuries earlier. Pfefferkorn's enthusiasm for the Christian faith was undeniable, but the results of his preaching were meager. In 1516, at the height of his fame, he claimed he had converted 14 Jews after years of effort. He claimed another five would have entered the Church if the Jews hadn't blackened his name. Pfefferkorn would become famous as a publicist, not as a preacher. The printing press was transforming the movement of information in Europe, and he made good use of this new technology.

In one of his earliest writings, *Der Juden Spiegel* (Mirror of the Jews) Pfefferkorn candidly describes his conversion. "I was born in the Jewish faith and am now, by the grace of God, a Christian," he wrote.[1] He lived by usury before converting, but gave it up as a Christian because usury is immoral. "If I continued to associate with Jews," he continued, "and continued to take usury, what would you say other than that I was in serious sin and that I never really became a Christian, and everyone would condemn me by saying that the blood and suffering of Christ had been lost on me. What help would the holy sacrament of baptism have been to me?"[2]

Pfefferkorn's admission he was a usurer is significant in light of later slanders. He was accused of criminal activity (and even of being hanged for it), but Pfefferkorn denied the charges, saying "two Jews wanted to sully my reputation with charges of theft."[3] Pfefferkorn filed suit against his accusers before the imperial court, and "they were obliged to pay 30 florins to cover my expenses and had to retract the accusations in public."[4] Most charges against Pfefferkorn are traceable to a document originating from the Jews of

Regensburg. Among its milder statements was the claim he was an illiterate butcher. He was neither illiterate nor was he a butcher, an occupation morally less reprehensible than that of moneylender.

In his groundbreaking *History of the Jews*, Heinrich Graetz recites the slanders faithfully and uncritically and adds a few of his own, calling Pfefferkorn "an ignorant, thoroughly vile creature," as well as "the scum of the Jewish people," and a "noisome insect"[5] who was a tool of the "ignorant and fanatical Dominicans" of Cologne, a city known to be "an owls' nest of light-shunning swaggerers, who endeavored to obscure the dawn of a bright day with the dark clouds of superstition hostile to knowledge."[6] The vehemence of Graetz's attack is not, it seems, a function of historical sources, but of the very specific damning charges Pfefferkorn leveled against the Jews about their rites and, more importantly, their covert attacks on Christians.

Graetz claims Pfefferkorn did not write the famous series of tracts that began with *Juden Spiegel* but instead "lent his name to a new anti-Jewish publication, written in Latin by Ortuinus Gratius," one of the light-shunning Dominican swaggerers.[7] The leader of the Cologne Dominicans was Jacob Hochstraten (or Hoogstraten, in honor of his native town). Graetz refers to him as "an inquisitor or heretic hunter . . . who literally longed for the smell of burning heretics and in Spain would have been a useful Torquemada."[8] Graetz's slanders are simply not true. Pfefferkorn, as his inimitable style and intimate knowledge of Jewish ritual indicate, wrote his own tracts. Hans-Martin Kirn says he "can in no way be seen as a 'tool' of the Cologne Dominicans."[9]

Ludwig Geiger, Graetz's contemporary, noted Pfefferkorn "was later accused of scandalous activity by his enemies," including the scurrilous charge that "his wife. . . had illicit intercourse with the Dominicans," but Geiger concluded "there is no proof for this allegation or the others," and wonders "how did they come into existence?"[10] The answer is simple. Stung by Pfefferkorn's criticism, the Jews invented slanders to blacken his name and dissuade others from taking him seriously. Geiger, like Graetz, was a German Jew, but, unlike Graetz, not so enraged by Pfefferkorn's conversion as to accept unfounded slanders.

The times had changed since Nicholas Donin's conversion in the 13th century; the odium of being Jewish stuck with Pfefferkorn in spite of his baptism. The Dominicans and the Franciscans faithfully supported him in his efforts to convert the Jews, but the mendicants no longer were the cutting edge of European thought. Something had happened to the European mind; it was Pfefferkorn's lot to discover what.

Pfefferkorn characterized himself as a wandering preacher to the Jews immediately following his conversion. *Der Juden Spiegel* was supposed to show Jews their errors and prove the truth of Christianity. His second book, *Judenbeichte*, ridiculed Jewish penitential practices. In 1513, Pfefferkorn received a permanent position in charge of the Hospital of St. Ursula and St.

Revillen in Cologne, a position he held until the end of his life. While traveling through Mainz, Oppenheim, Heidelberg, Ulm and Munich he made contact with the Franciscans who suggested in the confessional that he take up the battle against Jewish books, Jewish usury, and for Jewish conversion.

Pfefferkorn, like Donin, knew Judaism from the inside. That familiarity precipitated Graetz's rage. Pfefferkorn had studied Jewish writings with his uncle, a rabbi. Countering the claim that he was illiterate, a butcher, and a thief was a document emanating from Dachau in 1504, in which Pfefferkorn portrayed the Jews as engaging in covert warfare against Christians through usury and the subversion of religious vows. The Jews, according to Pfefferkorn, subverted the monks' vow of poverty by bribery, their vow of chastity by sexual seduction, and their vow of obedience by undermining all authority. Pfefferkorn pointed to more than 40 Christians who had abandoned the faith as a result of Jewish subversion, almost three times the number of Jews he had brought to Christianity by his preaching.

Pfefferkorn "spoke with the air of a man who was giving away secrets."[11] Because of his insider's knowledge, his claims were a threat to the Jews. In his pamphlet, *Ich bin ain Buchlinn der Juden veindt ist mein namen*, or *The Enemy of the Jews* (1509), Pfefferkorn reiterated Donin's claims, documenting Jewish blasphemies against Jesus, Mary, and the apostles, and the curses against Christians the Jews incorporated into their daily prayers. The Jews, said Pfefferkorn, utter "various insults and shameless words . . . every day against God, Mary, his most worthy mother, and the whole heavenly host."[12] The Jews call Jesus "*mamser ben hanido*," which is to say, "one born from an unclean union."[13] Although Pfefferkorn doesn't say so, "mamser" is traditionally translated "bastard." The Jews are similarly vehement in denouncing Christ's mother, calling her a "*sono*," which Pfefferkorn translates as "a notorious sinner." Again Pfefferkorn is discrete; the word means "whore." Pfefferkorn says the Jews call Christian churches "*mosschoff*" or "*beskisse*," "that is [latrines or] shithouses."[14] Additionally, the Jews "hate the sign of the holy cross and find it quite unbearable. If they see pieces of wood or straw on the ground that are by chance arranged roughly in the shape of a cross, they push it apart with their feet that they may no longer have to look at it."[15] If a Jew "knowingly crosses a churchyard or listens to an organ," he "believes that his prayers will not be heard by God for 30 days."[16]

Pfefferkorn also claimed Jews were revolutionaries who "pray for vengeance against the whole Christian church and especially the Roman Empire, that it may be broken up and destroyed."[17] The prayer for revolution is so significant that the Jews "are not allowed to say this prayer sitting down; rather, they must stand. Nor are they permitted to talk among themselves until the prayer is ended."[18] Whenever "war or rebellion breaks out among us Christians," Pfefferkorn says, the Jews "are heartily pleased, hoping that the time is near when the Empire will be destroyed." Pfefferkorn wrote *Juden veindt* to

"prevent the damage which the mangy dogs [i.e., the Jews] do to Christian power in both the spiritual and the worldly sphere."[19] The humanists and the reformers, who saw Pfefferkorn as a tool of the powers of darkness, would ignore his warning. But within three years of his death, German peasants had driven more than one prince from his throne in Southern Germany, and it looked as if the revolutionary spirit was going to spread to France and the Low Countries too.

In part two of *Juden veindt*, "How the Jews ruin land and people," Pfefferkorn describes how Jews get money through usury; he also "explains the harm and damage the Jews cause to the country and the people through usury" by explaining how debt accumulates when interest is compounded.[20] After 30 years, "the debt amounts to an unfathomable 106 tons of gold, 14,810 Gulden, 28 Wiesspfennig and 11 Heller!" "Thus the poor Christian, when he has nothing further to pawn, must run away and live out his life in poverty, which happens often and many times."[21]

In part three, Pfefferkorn explains how Jews use money to corrupt the morals of Christians. Jews use "their ill-gotten wealth" to "cause Christians to commit great sins."[22] Jews usually prevail in court because of bribery. "The only reason for this is their ill-gotten money, which Christians accept from them in exchange for helping to muddle and cover up their case and make it appear just."[23] Jews use their wealth "to lead astray not only the common people but even educated men"[24] by corrupting the morals of Christians and by undermining their faith. The Jews, Pfefferkorn writes,

> cause many Christians, learned and unlearned, to doubt their faith, as I have shown in other books of mine. Thus there is much heresy where Jews live; also one finds that Christians commit unchaste acts with Jews and have children by them. These children remain Jews, which is no doubt a great, notable, and shameful evil. Christian blood is subjected to eternal damnation, and, as I have mentioned at the beginning of my booklet, there is in the whole city no sect or nation that hates the Christians more than the Jews.[25]

The Jews also live in a world of political illusions, generated by the "central hope of the Jews" that "a messiah . . . will deliver them." This messiah "will come as a secular ruler, a king with great power and wealth to rule and subdue the world." Pfefferkorn reveals the secrets of the Jews at great personal risk because "I know well, if I fell among Jews, they would devour me as the wolf devours sheep, for this was reported to me." Jews from several countries, he continues, "have made a pact to kill and murder" him. Pfefferkorn warns, "if I should disappear, have no other thoughts than that I was killed by the Jews as they killed others before me."[26]

Pfefferkorn concludes his pamphlet by urging Christian rulers to regulate the lives of Jews more closely. They should be forced to give up usury and

to take on lowly occupations like sweeping dung in the streets. As his final point, he makes a recommendation that would generate conflict for the next decade. Indeed, if Graetz is right in seeing the battle of the books as the spark that set off the Reformation, it would generate conflict for centuries to come. Pfefferkorn recommended confiscating Jewish books, specifically the Talmud, because, deprived of their books, the Jews would abandon their false beliefs and embrace Christianity. Like Donin, Pfefferkorn felt Jewish heresy was a function of the Talmud. Deprived of the books that were blinding their minds and poisoning their souls, the Jews would embrace the Christian faith.

Instead of going to the pope, as had Donin, Pfefferkorn approached the emperor. In 1509 he applied to the imperial court for the right to confiscate Jewish books. Kunigunde von Bayern, the devout sister of Emperor Maximilian I, provided a letter of introduction to the emperor, who endorsed Pfefferkorn's proposals and authorized him to confiscate Jewish books and to "examine Hebrew writings anywhere in the German empire, and to destroy all whose contents were hostile to the Bible and the Christian faith."[27] In September, Pfefferkorn arrived in Frankfurt, home of the richest and most powerful Jewish community in the German empire. At his command, the city senate ordered the Jews to assemble in the synagogue, where they were told to hand over their books. One thousand five hundred manuscripts were taken from the Jews and deposited in the town hall. One letter from the archives of the Jewish community in Frankfurt recites

> On Friday [28 September 1509] the butcher [i.e., Pfefferkorn] came to us here in Frankfurt, together with three priests and two friends from the city council, and they seized the books in the synagogue—the Tefilot, Machzorim and Slechot—everything they could find, and forbade us in the name of the emperor to continue praying in the synagogue.[28]

The Jews did not sit idle. Humanistic studies of the sort promoted by Erasmus of Rotterdam had suggested that a new day of enlightened tolerance was about to dawn after the long night of Scholastic obscurantism, and so the Jews were emboldened to act. The Jews sent Rabbi Gumprecht Weissenan to the archbishop of Mainz, who was persuaded that Pfefferkorn's activities infringed on his episcopal jurisdiction. It was unusual for an individual of no official rank to receive such a mandate, and the emperor's action drew immediate protests both from Jewish representatives and from the archbishop of Mainz, who informed Pfefferkorn that the mandate was legally defective. Rabbi Weissenan, notes the same archival letter, was "successful with his request, and, praise be to God, obtained help and salvation for the Jews."[29]

After warning German Jews that "should any community. . . refuse to send money and participate in our efforts. . . they will no longer be regarded as members of the Association of the Remnant of Israel," the Jews sent another delegation, led by Jonathan Levi Zion, to the imperial court to negotiate

withdrawal of Pfefferkorn's mandate.[30] Levi Zion was frank in his report to the Jews in Frankfurt. "I shall not be able to achieve anything until you send a man who is prepared for three things—you know what I mean."[31] Levi Zion's letter referred to Raschi's commentary on Gen 32:8 which mentions prayer, combat, and bribery as three ways to defeat an enemy. Levi Zion and the Jews at Frankfurt settled on the last alternative as the best course. After pleading for money, "as soon as possible so that I shall not be forced to borrow money here at 100 percent,"[32] Levi Zion announced by letter that he had bribed the Margrave of Baden, whom the emperor had assigned to handle Pfefferkorn's case. "For this," Levi Zion wrote, "I gave him [the Margrave of Baden] something, and should we obtain what we are asking for in the petition, I shall give him an additional one hundred Gulden for his efforts. And so he acted on our behalf and made a great personal effort" to annul Pfefferkorn's mandate.[33] Even so, Levi Zion still felt "Everything is upside down. The apostate and his courtiers have persuaded the emperor to write to the archbishop that [Pfefferkorn] should be the commissioner in this business, together with the apostate Viktor [von Karben] in Cologne, another doctor from Cologne, a doctor from Heidelberg and Dr. Reuchlin from Stuttgart."[34]

This is the first time Reuchlin's name appears in the controversy surrounding the confiscation of the Talmud, and the context is significant. Johannes Reuchlin is mentioned in the same letter in which Levi Zion admits bribing the Margrave of Baden. Levi Zion then asks for more money, presumably for more bribes. Since "it is very likely that the apostate [i.e., Pfefferkorn] will be commissioned to proceed," the Jews "must immediately send wise and prudent men from our communities to the emperor. They must of course be well supplied with gold and silver, and must beseech the emperor to be merciful and spare us. . . for I fear things that I do not want to write down."[35]

The Jews reacted to the threat of losing their books by bribing court officials and slandering Pfefferkorn at the imperial court during the winter of 1509-10. In the spring, their efforts paid off. Emperor Maximilian I ordered the Frankfurt senate to return the books. To play down the injury to Pfefferkorn and the Dominicans and "to avoid any complaints on the part of the Jews that this had been undertaken lightly and without diligent consideration,"[36] the emperor created a commission to examine the Jews' books. Maximilian authorized the archbishop of Mainz to solicit reports from four universities as well as from qualified individuals. Johannes Reuchlin was one of those qualified individuals.

As a result, Johannes Reuchlin was appointed to the commission. "It was fortunate for the Jews," Graetz writes, "that the honest, truthful Reuchlin, so enthusiastically prepossessed for Hebrew and Cabalistic literature, was asked to give his opinion of Jewish literature."[37] Johannes Reuchlin was, next to Erasmus of Rotterdam, the most prominent scholar of his day. Like Erasmus and the humanists, Reuchlin saw scholarship as the study of language rather

than dialectic in the Scholastic mode. Unlike Erasmus, who confined himself to Latin and Greek texts, Reuchlin immersed himself in Hebrew as early as the mid-1480s. Reuchlin's interest in Hebrew blossomed while he was on an embassy to the papal court in 1490.

Reuchlin traveled to Italy as the crisis over the newly translated hermetic texts and their connection to magic reached its climax. There Reuchlin met the recently reborn Platonic Academy in Florence under the direction of Lorenzo de Medici. In 1463, Lorenzo's father had commissioned Marsilio Ficino to translate "*Corpus Hereticum*," which a monk had brought from Macedonia. Ficino then steeped himself in the neoplatonic mysteries Julian the Apostate found so seductive a millennium earlier. Ficino aided in the translation of the "Hermetica" and "Orphica," which constituted the neoplatonic teachings, including the "Chaldean Oracles," ascribed to the followers of Zarathustra, as well as the teaching of Pythagoras, which included many magic spells, esoteric teachings, and customs.

Pope Innocent VIII began to suspect that the neoplatonic Academy was involved in more than simple antiquarian pursuits. In 1490, one year before Reuchlin met Count Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, Garsias alleged at Pope Innocent's urging that Pico, Ficino's pupil, was promoting magic. For two years, the sword of Damocles dangled over Pico's head. Then Innocent VIII died in 1492, and Alexander VI succeeded him. In his *46 Sentences*, Pico defended himself against the accusations of his opponents, and after his presentation, on June 18, 1493, Pope Alexander VI cleared him of the charges laid against him. The way was then clear for the resurgence of Christian interest in magic. In her book on Giordano Bruno, Frances Yates laid the responsibility for that resurgence at the feet of Alexander VI, whom she claims had a special relationship to the Egyptian mysteries, astrology, and magic, as evidenced in the Pintarucchio frescoes in the Borgia apartments.[38] Zika is more pointed. He claims the attitude of the papal court changed when Alexander VI became pope because Alexander was intent on putting "occult magic to his own use."[39]

One year after Pico's acquittal, Reuchlin published *De verbo mirifico*, The Wonder-Working Word, his attempt to revive philosophy, lately fallen into the slumber of Scholasticism, by linking it to the Hebrew language, Cabala, and magic. In it, Baruchia, a Jew, Sidonius, a philosopher once an Epicurean but now knowledgeable in many different systems, and Reuchlin, under the name Capnion (the Greek word for smoke is *Kapnos* or *Rauch* in German. Reuchlin is the diminutive of *Rauch*), conduct a dialogue. The three are not divided by their religions; like the masons at a later date, they are united by esoteric wisdom derived from the Cabala. Socrates was a wise man, but the wisest was Moses, who was wise not through his own intellectual powers but rather through the spirit of God in him. Only this spirit, transmitted from one race to another and now known as Cabala, makes one capable of penetrating the

secrets of nature through the wonderworking word. The most wonderworking of all words is the unspeakable Tetragrammaton JHVH (the four consonants comprising the name Yahweh), which is similar to the Tetrakys of Pythagoras. Each letter has its own secret meaning. Ihsvh is the most secret name, because it adds the letter signifying Jesus.

Like Karl Marx three centuries later, Reuchlin claimed philosophy would "work wonders." It would change the world by unleashing the power of the magic words which God himself uttered to Moses and Adam. To begin the study of magic, the adept needed to learn Hebrew to use "practical Cabala," another word for magic. Like messianic politics, magic was a way of bringing about heaven on earth and was intimately bound up with the rise of the new scientific worldview. Magic was associated in the popular mind with Jews. Jews knew how to cast the spells that would bring about this-worldly riches and power. Both magic and applied science involved a turning away from the Cross, which is to say, the God-ordained necessity of suffering in this life if one wants to attain salvation. In the place of the Cross, the adept of practical Cabala proposes the techniques refined by Jews that enable one to get what one wants. Four centuries after the publication of *De verbo mirifico*, C.S. Lewis noticed

> There is something which unites magic and applied science while separating both from the "wisdom" of earlier ages. For the wise men of old the cardinal problem had been how to conform the soul to reality, and the solution had been knowledge, self-discipline and virtue. For magic and applied science alike the problem is how to subdue reality to the wishes of men: the solution is a technique, and both, in the practice of this technique, are ready to do things hitherto regarded as disgusting and impious—such as digging up and mutilating the dead.[40]

The seeds planted at the Platonic Academy of Florence under the patronage of the Medicis bore fruit at the turn of the century. In 1501, Giovanni Mercurio showed up in Lyon wearing flowing white robes and a chain around his neck, announcing he was omniscient and could change lead into gold and bring happiness to the depressed. The chain derived from the same Pythagorean chain of love and friendship whose symbology would exert its influence over Reuchlin.

Reuchlin's *De verbo mirifico* introduced the idea of neoplatonic magic to the lands north of the Alps. In it, Reuchlin tried to break down the barriers separating religion, philosophy, and magic through recourse to the Hebrew language in general and in particular through the rehabilitation of Cabala, which he saw as the oral esoteric tradition that had come from Adam himself. Cabala, of course, had no ancient pedigree. It apparently arose in the 12th century in Provence; it was the Jewish equivalent of the Albigensian heresy, a resurgence of neoplatonic gnosticism. None of the proponents of Cabala, however, saw it that way. Instead they viewed it as the original theology, the

prisca theologia, at least as old as Christianity and probably much older than that. Pico had already established a necessary connection between Cabala and magic in his writings. Reuchlin took his ideas one step further by claiming that natural magic was impossible without the Cabala. Reuchlin separated himself from the magic manuals of the Middle Ages. In place of these magic spells, which were either meaningless mumbo-jumbo or, worse, appeals to evil spirits, Reuchlin proposed the magic of the Hebrews found in the Cabala and intimately bound up with their language, the language of God Himself. Reuchlin claimed because God spoke in Hebrew, Hebrew words uttered in the proper way had an immediate physical effect. They could not bring about creation *ex nihilo*, but they might very well influence the angels put in charge of that creation by God. In learning Hebrew, as Reuchlin did at the feet of rabbis, the adept learned the language God Himself had used to speak to Moses. Men could now use that same language in speaking to the angels who ran the universe and create wonders by their very words. Zoroaster, the first theologian, according to their view, recognized the unique nature of Hebrew words and so forbade any alteration of their form because the divine power of the word was only effective in its original Hebrew form. During the dialogue between the three learned men in *De verbo mirifico*, Reuchlin expands his praise of Hebrew into an attack on Greek, which, in the words of Baruchias, the learned Jew, possesses "no words that have come down to us from heaven and no names which can be characterized as having divinely ordained syllables."[41] Moses, because he spoke Hebrew, had priority over the Egyptians as well because the Hebrew language is more ancient. "Divine names come to us from the Jews and not the Egyptians. Hebrew names are more ancient and holier than any other names."[42]

Taking his cue from Alexander VI's approval of Pico, Reuchlin defends the connection Pico established between Cabala and magic. In his "*Conclusiones*," Pico claimed that immediate access to divine mysteries and powers was available through the Cabala. Part of the Cabala was also the highest part of *magia naturalis*. Reuchlin claimed the Cabala demonstrated the validity of the Christian faith and also corresponded to the esoteric wisdom of Orpheus, Pythagoras, and Zoroaster. By locating the magical power of his system in the Hebrew language, Reuchlin hoped to evade the dichotomy the Church, following the classical tradition, had established. According to that dichotomy, a man either asked for power over nature, in which case his action was known as prayer and dependent on the permissive will of the deity; or he forced the issue by invoking evil spirits. Cabala seemed to indicate another possibility. The possibility of a middle ground between science and prayer based on the magical effects of angelic names in Hebrew seemed theologically unlikely, but that is the course Reuchlin pursued, hoping to evade the censure of those who claimed he was involved in black magic.

The Hebrew language saved Reuchlin, at least in his own mind, from becoming a proponent of black magic, which involved contact with demons and was practiced under the name of Solomon, Adam, or Enoch. Hebrew was the key to making contact with the good spirits whose silent help enabled the practice of *magia naturalis*. The true philosopher should not invoke demons, but if the philosopher is unable to perform wonders, he is no better than the garrulous Schoolmen who, like spiders, spin words but produce no effects. Sidonious says, "we would therefore be hardly distinguishable from the vulgar, if our miraculous vocation was not accompanied by miraculous actions."[43] Reuchlin's idea of a "wonder working" philosophy had much in common with Thomas Muentzer's view of scripture. To be truly alive, the word of God had to create signs and wonders. The same was true of Reuchlin's Cabalistic Philosophy: Philosophy had no value if it couldn't work wonders beyond the power of man to explain. The Cabala would rehabilitate philosophy by its miracles, which were bound up not with evil spirits but with the power of Hebrew.

Reuchlin's fatal attraction to Cabala took root on his journey to Italy when he studied with Obadaiah Sforno, a Jewish physician, philosopher, and more importantly, collector of rare Hebrew manuscripts and books. Two years later, Reuchlin was back in Italy, this time on an embassy to the imperial court in Padua. On this journey he received instruction from the emperor's court physician, Iacob ben Iehiel Loans. Reuchlin and Loans remained in contact for the next decade, and Reuchlin repeatedly expressed his admiration for his Jewish teacher. Fully aware of Reuchlin's intercourse with the rabbis, Pfefferkorn exclaimed later, "if I had said these things I would have been burned" at the stake.[44]

Studying the Cabala required a sort of hermetic initiation. The Cabala, Rummel says, "was taught hermetically, that is, reserved for the elect, and was often associated with magic, a connection deplored even by Jewish teachers of stature such as Moses Maimonides."[45] It would not have been taught to someone who was either skeptical or disinterested. It would only have been taught to someone avid to receive initiation into its mysteries. The Jewish masters who taught Reuchlin, therefore, must have seen in him a potential adept. "Christians," Rummel continues,

> began to take an interest in the Caballah during the fifteenth century. The Italian humanist Pico della Mirandola. . . connected the Caballah with "natural magic," that is, the study of celestial bodies, but rejected its counterpart, black magic, "which is rightly excised by the church and has no foundation, no truth and no basis.". . . Nevertheless it remained a controversial subject. It continued to attract the attention of inquisitorial courts and was therefore pursued by Reuchlin at some personal risk.[46]

After Reuchlin met Pico and learned about the Cabala, Graetz says, he "thirsted for Hebrew literature, but could not quench his thirst."[47] More accurately, Reuchlin desired to learn Hebrew to slake his thirst for esoteric and arcane knowledge. In *De verbo mirifico*, Reuchlin wrote "The language of the Hebrews is simple, uncorrupted, holy, terse and vigorous; God conversed in it direct with men, and men with angels, without interpreters face to face. . . as one friend converses with another."[48]

In 1506, Reuchlin issued *De rudimentis Hebraicis*, the first Hebrew grammar ever written by a non-Jew. Four years later, when Reuchlin was at the height of his powers and reputation, Pfefferkorn approached him after he heard Reuchlin had been appointed an expert witness for the commission then deliberating Pfefferkorn's plan to seize the books of the Jews. Pfefferkorn came away from the meeting pleased, claiming Reuchlin had been cordial and had even graciously instructed him on the fine points of etiquette and protocol at the imperial court.

Reuchlin completed his evaluation on October 6, 1510 and sent it to the emperor in a sealed envelope. He recommended that two books, *Nizzachon* and *Toledoth Jeschu*, should be confiscated and destroyed; the Jews should be allowed to keep their other works. This meant that Reuchlin did not include the Talmud among the "books which ridicule, slander and insult our Great Lord and God Jesus and his mother, and the apostles and saints."[49] He said "I have read only two such books: one called Nizzachon, the other Tolduth Jeschu ha nozri." Reuchlin gives the impression that these books had no standing in the Jewish community: "Even the Jews themselves regard them as apocryphal."[50] While at the court of Frederick III, Reuchlin "heard the Jews themselves saying in the frequent conversations I had with them that they have removed and destroyed such books and forbidden that people should in future write such books or speak thus."[51]

At this point in his report, Reuchlin's testimony becomes problematical if not erroneous and self-contradictory: "If the Talmud were deserving of such condemnation, our ancestors of many hundred years ago, whose zeal for Christianity was much greater than ours, would have burnt it."[52] Reuchlin says no pope ever burned the Talmud, but Geiger corrects the historical record by reminding the reader that both Gregory IX and Innocent IV had consigned copies of the Talmud to the flames.[53] Reuchlin might have been an expert in Hebrew philology and grammar (Graetz disputes this), but he was abysmally ignorant of the history of the Talmud, which had been burned more than once by his "ancestors." Reuchlin claimed "The baptized Jews Peter Schwarz and Pfefferkorn, the only persons who insist on its being burnt, probably wish it for private reasons."[54] Yet Reuchlin made these claims after admitting that he, unlike Pfefferkorn, had neither read the Talmud nor understood it! "No one," Reuchlin continued, "can say in truth that the Talmud, in which the four higher faculties are described, is completely evil and that one cannot

learn anything good from it. For it contains many good medical prescriptions and information about plants and roots as well as legal verdicts collected from all over the world by experienced Jews."[55]

Reuchlin then characterized the Talmud as "a work which is difficult to understand."[56] He also said that there were many strange ideas in the Talmud, but that did not justify its destruction. Of the Jews, Reuchlin said, "whether they are inimically disposed toward us in their hearts, only God can say."[57] Defense of the Cabala was unnecessary, because the pope had already recognized its value, and Pico had shown Christians could use its teachings to strengthen the Christian faith. Jews could not be called heretics because they had never fallen away from the Christian faith. The Jews had the right to retain their property, including the Talmud, because they were citizens—a then unusual term—of the German empire.

Despite stating that it needed no defense, Reuchlin then defended the Cabala, which he referred to as "the most secret speech and words of God."[58] Reuchlin claimed theologians who did not know Hebrew had made serious theological errors, an assertion that undermined theology, according to the Dominicans, by making it a function of scripture scholarship, which is to say, language studies, not dialectics. He concluded "No Christian should pass verdict on [the Jews], except in a secular case transacted in a secular court. For they are not members of the Christian church, and their faith is none of our business."[59] The claim "their faith is none of our business" combined with the equally daring claim Jews had rights as citizens, did not endear Reuchlin to the Dominicans, whose mission since Penafort had been the papally mandated conversion of the Jews.

In his report, Reuchlin denounced Pfefferkorn's writings as the work of an ignorant hatemonger, thus establishing the debate's parameters: the refined man of letters vs. the ignorant "*tauf iud*," a racist slur picked up by Reuchlin's supporters, including Erasmus of Rotterdam. Pfefferkorn called Reuchlin a Judaizer, a term then in the process of losing its opprobrium among educated humanists. Reuchlin's claim that knowledge of Hebrew was necessary for the correct interpretation of the Bible was guaranteed to offend theologians, no matter how much it pleased humanists. Those theologians, under the direction of the Cologne Dominicans, still wielded considerable political power, although not as much as in previous centuries. The conflict settled into the Humanist vs. Scholastic mode, even though (or perhaps, according to Rummel, because) it obscured the central contention of Pfefferkorn and the Dominicans, namely, that Reuchlin was a Judaizer. Indeed, judaizing was a virtue to those who made theology a function of Hebrew grammar; it would soon become equally esteemed by the Reformers who believed that theology must be based on "Scripture alone." The most significant part of the report is Reuchlin's praise of the Cabala:

> I have read it myself. One could argue about the pros and cons for a long time in this report. But one may see from the book entitled Apologia by the earlier mentioned Count of Mirandola, which has been approved by Pope Alexander, that the books of the Cabala are not only harmless, but of great use to the Christian faith, and Pope Sixtus IV had them translated into Latin for the use of us Christians. There are sufficient grounds therefore to conclude that such books as the Cabala should not and cannot be legally suppressed and burned. . . . Jewish commentaries should not and cannot be abandoned by the Christian church, for they keep the special characteristics of the Hebrew language before our eyes. The bible cannot be interpreted without them, especially the Old Testament, just as we cannot do without the Greek language and Greek grammars and commentaries for the New Testament, as is confirmed and indicated in canon law.[60]

Since "the Jews are our archivists, librarians and antiquarians, who preserve books that can serve as witnesses to our faith," Christians should "take care of the existing books, protect and respect them, rather than burn them, for from them flows the true meaning of the language and our understanding of Sacred Scripture."[61]

One needn't be a learned theologian to see that Reuchlin was turning the Talmud into a meta-Scripture that would serve as the criterion of what was valid in the Bible. The hermetic texts had become the real Scriptures, and they were to be interpreted not by the Catholic Church, but by the nascent academic establishment, which had taken instruction at the feet of the rabbis in an atmosphere of quasi-masonic hermeticism. Even Reuchlin's caveat against books promoting magic was qualified to the point of meaninglessness:

> If there are, however, Hebrew books that teach or instruct readers in the forbidden arts, such as sorcery, magic and witchcraft, if they may be used to harm people, they should be destroyed, torn up and burned because they are against nature. But if such books of magic are designed only to help and benefit human life and serve no harmful purpose, one should not burn or destroy them, except books about buried treasures.[62]

And who was to decide whether a particular Hebrew text was blasphemous or instead a "buried treasure"? The implication seems clear: only those who knew Hebrew were qualified to decide. The ultimate authority in the Church devolved upon those who had taken hermetic instruction from the rabbis, as had Reuchlin. Otherwise, "the Jews ought to be left in peace in their synagogues, and in the exercise of ceremonies, rites, customs, habits and devotions, especially when they do not go against what is right and do not manifestly insult our Christian church" because "the Christian church has nothing to do with them. . . as long as the Jews keep the peace, they ought to be left in peace. And all this must be observed so that they cannot say that

they are being forced and compelled to convert to our faith."[63] In an especially self-serving passage, Reuchlin recommended that the German universities should "hire for the next ten years two lecturers each, who would be capable and have the task of teaching students Hebrew and instructing them in this language. . . . If this is done, I doubt not that in a few years our students will be so well versed in the Hebrew language that they will be able to bring the Jews over to our side with reasonable and friendly words and gentle means."[64]

Pfefferkorn gained access to Reuchlin's report and was outraged. Every scholar appointed to the commission had written in favor of Pfefferkorn's proposal, except Reuchlin. Pfefferkorn gave his interpretation of what had happened in *Handt Spiegel*, published in Spring, 1511. Pfefferkorn claimed "a fat Jew sat on his book,"[65] which is to say, Reuchlin had been suborned by the Jews. "All," Pfefferkorn continued, "with the exception of Johannes Reuchlin, unanimously declared and wrote for Christ, inspired by the Holy Spirit. His report alone . . . supported the perfidy of the Jews rather than the Apostolic See and the most holy cause of our faith."[66] Pfefferkorn denounced Reuchlin as a "half-Jew" and a "Judas."[67] As a result of Reuchlin's recommendation, the emperor did not renew the mandate to confiscate the Jewish books. Reuchlin had killed the project, and Pfefferkorn was furious.

Pfefferkorn correctly claimed "the Jews bribed Christians in high places . . . and they filled the ears of the good Emperor with false advice, so that His Imperial Majesty gave orders to restore the books to the Jews."[68] Pfefferkorn knew about the bribe Levi Zion gave the Margrave of Baden; he claimed that Reuchlin had been bribed also because the Jews had told him, "Reuchlin knows how to deal with you and oppose you. . . . They told me that they were in close contact with Reuchlin and very well informed about this matter." Pfefferkorn recalled the German proverb, "*Die Gelehrten, Die Verkehrten*," which is to say, "The learned are easily corrupted."[69]

Pfefferkorn felt doubly betrayed because, on the basis of his private consultation with Reuchlin in 1510, he felt he had nothing to fear from Reuchlin. "He treated me most cordially," he reported, "and expressed pleasure at my coming, and what is more he instructed me in what to do in the presence of the Emperor, of which I have proof in his own handwriting. Then when he had cleverly found out everything about the matter from me, he falsely reassured me and devoutly promised to write to me. He did no such thing, but instead traduced me in his report to His Royal Majesty, contrary to his promise and acting, most impiously. . . . And so he betrayed me, as Judas betrayed Christ."[70]

Reuchlin was furious when he learned Pfefferkorn was privy to what he considered a confidential evaluation, meant only for the emperor's eyes. He accused Pfefferkorn of breaking the seal on his report and gaining illicit access. Reuchlin claimed Pfefferkorn was a pawn of the Cologne Dominicans. In 1518, Ortwin Gratius, a leader of the Cologne Dominicans, denied they

bore any responsibility for the publication of the *Handt Spiegel*. Pfefferkorn was in Mainz when *Handt Spiegel* appeared at the Frankfurt book convention in April 1511. Taking Reuchlin's part in the controversy, Graetz also claimed Pfefferkorn was a pawn of the Dominicans, who concocted the scheme to confiscate the Talmud so they could extort money from the Jews. Since the Jews "could not do without the Talmud," they "would pour their wealth into Dominican coffers to have the confiscation annulled."[71] Graetz also claimed Pfefferkorn lured Reuchlin into "a cunningly devised trap,"[72] but gives no evidence to support his claim.

The Dominicans accused Reuchlin of disingenuousness. The Jews' hatred for Christians was universally known; every Jew who had left Judaism could tell stories about it. Only a few Christians, "especially Johannes Reuchlin from Stuckarten" denied this hatred and would not admit that Jews prayed against Christians. Anyone who denied this knew nothing of Jewish scriptures; Reuchlin's admitted ignorance of the Talmud meant he had not written the document that appeared under his name. Reuchlin was handicapped in responding because he was caught in a contradiction. He claimed the Talmud was not pernicious, and yet he admitted he had never read it. The Dominicans pressed the issue, reminding Reuchlin that there weren't just two pernicious Jewish books, and that the Jews did not proscribe the two he mentioned. Quite to the contrary, the Jews read from *Toledoth Jeschu* every year at Christmastime in the hope that God would punish Jesus because of his false teaching.

After Pfefferkorn published *Handt Spiegel*, Reuchlin took his case to the emperor. Not content to wait for a legal verdict, Reuchlin joined battle in the realm of political publishing, newly created by the invention of the printing press. In late August or early September of 1511, Reuchlin issued his pamphlet *Augenspiegel* (Eye Mirror or Spectacles—an image of a pair of glasses was on the title page), which defended both Jewish books and his own integrity as a disinterested scholar. But, according to Graetz, Reuchlin was an avowed enemy of the circumcised. Reuchlin's writings were suffused with racism, including routine reference to Pfefferkorn as a "*taufft jud*," what the Spaniards would term a *marrano* or *converso*. Reuchlin wanted to rescue the Jewish scriptures for the cabalists. Neither he nor his colleagues were fond of Jews. Indeed, their dislike of Jews did not stop even after the Jew became baptized. In this, they were less like their forbears of the crusades and more like their descendants of the Third Reich, who felt, as Edith Stein was to learn, that baptism did not erase Jewishness, because Jewishness was a racial phenomenon, not religious. Pfefferkorn complained bitterly and often about the racist remarks of professors and preachers, who, as fellow Christians, should have accepted him as a brother, but instead made remarks like "To trust a Jew is like putting a snake to your bosom, a burning coal in your lap, and a mouse in your pocket."[73] Pfefferkorn thought that way about Jews, too,

but was offended that his fellow Christians thought that way about him after his baptism.

In November 1510, the theology faculty at the University of Cologne issued two reports responding to Reuchlin's letter to the emperor. The theologians reminded Reuchlin that the Talmud contained "not only errors and false statements, but also blasphemies and heresies against their own law."[74] For this reason, Popes Gregory and Innocent had "ordered the said book to be burned." The Talmud and the Cabala were "corrupt;" they were fundamentally different from and therefore did not "convey the intention of Moses' books and those of other [Hebrew] prophets and wise men."[75] Unlike Reuchlin, who sought to preserve the books to derive esoteric knowledge from them, the faculty at Cologne decreed that Pfefferkorn and the Dominicans were acting for the common good. That meant "it would be impious and irreligious to allow them the use of such books which they, who are mockers and blasphemers of the Lord Christ, might use to teach their children."[76] Proceeding against the Talmud was "in the interest of the Christian faith as well as of the Jews' salvation,"[77] an idea that Reuchlin subverted when he said that what Jews believed was none of Christians' business. The Dominicans then reiterated the concerns articulated at the Fourth Lateran Council 300 years earlier:

> it seems expedient to prevent the Jews from practicing usury and to allow them to take up honest work for a living, but let them be distinguished from Christians by a badge, and let them be taught in their own language by experienced converts about the true law and the prophets for the glory of God, their own salvation and the increase of the Christian faith.[78]

The emperor was unmoved. He refused to order re-confiscation of the books. Reuchlin was wrong when he claimed the Talmud had never been burned, but he was right in claiming that the piety of his ancestors' generation exceeded that of his own. As we have seen, a new spirit was abroad, one which condoned blasphemy in the name of scholarship and disapproved of burning books as something that educated people did not do.

The Jews were overjoyed by the emperor's verdict. Like their ancestors at the foot of Mount Sinai, the Jews made two images, "one of Johann Reuchlin in angelic form, like a prophet; the other, of Pfefferkorn, in the shape of a devil."[79] They danced around the images like pagans around a sacrifice, genuflecting to Reuchlin's image and sticking knives into Pfefferkorn's. Pfefferkorn and Hoogstraten were outraged by Jewish effrontery. "If the Jews are permitted to retain the books that have been taken from them by imperial mandate," Hoogstraten wrote, "they will be confirmed in their perfidy; they will insult Christians and cast in their teeth that the books would not have been restored to them by imperial edict if they were not true and holy."[80]

Hoogstraten did not claim the Jews had bribed Reuchlin, but others did. Gregor Reisch, a Carthusian prior, made the claim, which is reported by

Geiger.[81] Graetz said bribery was the charge that bothered Reuchlin the most, and he rejected it forcefully. Reuchlin admitted he had had dealings with Jews, but he was infuriated over the claim he had been bribed by the Jews: "I say therefore, by the highest faith, that in my entire life from the days of my childhood up to this hour that I have not received one nickel, not one penny, from the Jews, neither have I received gold or silver nor do I hope to."[82] "No Jew," he continued, "offered me rent, services or any kind of reward. And anyone who writes otherwise injures my honor and is a liar and a base villain."[83]

Reuchlin's *Augenspiegel* caused an immediate sensation. Within a few weeks, it was read all over the Germanies. Pfefferkorn claimed the Jews rushed out to buy Reuchlin's book as soon as they heard it dealt with them favorably. But Geiger claims that once the Jews got their books back in 1510, they lost interest in the controversy. Graetz claims the Jews naturally saw Reuchlin as their champion and just as naturally promoted his book. They were pleased and dumbfounded "to find that so distinguished a man as Reuchlin would set an accuser of the Jews in the pillory as a calumniator and liar."[84] Having one of the most distinguished Christian scholars in Europe defend the Talmud left Jews rubbing their eyes in amazement. The Jews rushed out to buy Reuchlin's book, and, using their commercial connections, made it an instant bestseller, perhaps the first in history. "The Jews," according to Graetz, "greedily bought a book in which for the first time a man of honor entered the lists on their behalf. . . . They rejoiced at having found a champion. . . Who would find fault with them for laboring in the promulgation of Reuchlin's pamphlet?"[85]

In September 1511, Peter Meyer, a pastor in Frankfurt, allowed Pfefferkorn to preach a counter-attack on Reuchlin's pamphlet, something which outraged Reuchlin even more since Pfefferkorn was a married layman. The Dominicans were furious because Reuchlin had ruined their centuries-old campaign to convert the Jews; they demanded confiscation and destruction of any remaining copies of the *Augenspiegel*. Arnold von Tungern, a leader of the Cologne faction, wrote to the emperor complaining that the *Augenspiegel* was full of assertions promoting Judaism that would strengthen the Jews in their defiance of the Christian faith. Since Reuchlin boldly refused to retract his errors and countered with threats of his own, von Tungern concluded correctly that he knew that he had many supporters ready to protect him. Virtually the entire humanist community had united behind Reuchlin, and out of that group would come many "Reformers," including Martin Luther and Ulrich von Hutten, who later wrote to Reuchlin pledging his support.

By this point, the controversy had gone well beyond its initial impetus. Geiger says the affair began as a crusade against Jews, but the confrontation between humanists and scholastics soon eclipsed the original issue. By 1511, he said, "the business of the [Jewish] books was over, and the intellectual battle began . . . its character changed for this and assumed an essentially different

form. There were barely any references to the books from that point on, and none at all to the Jews. At issue was the right to express one's opinion freely, to counter the inquisitorial fixation on heresy."[86] But the focus of the debate also shifted because Reuchlin, with images of the Spanish Inquisition fresh in his mind, felt that the charges of judaizing were serious to the point of being life-threatening. As a result he wanted to guide the uproar into safer channels.

In September 1512, Jacob Hoogstraten summoned Reuchlin to appear before the Inquisition in Mainz to defend himself against charges of heresy and judaizing. If the issue, as Geiger claimed, was no longer the Jews, Hoogstraten was unaware of the change. "You," the Dominican wrote to Reuchlin

> appeared before Christian readers as a champion of the perfidious Jews. And you made this impression also on the Jews themselves, who are hostile toward the Cross and the blood through which we have been purified and redeemed. As we hear, they read your tract, which has been written and published in our vernacular language, and disseminated it. Thus you have given them an opportunity to deride us more than ever, for they found that among Christians and especially Christians who had a reputation for great learning, you were the only one who spoke on their behalf and maintained and defended their cause. [87]

The Dominicans got an order from the emperor allowing them to confiscate copies of the *Augenspiegel* and to burn them in public. The students at the university protested, but the confiscation continued, and all were to be burned on October 12, when an order halting the burning arrived. Pfefferkorn countered by publishing *Brandspiegel* (Burning Mirror), which Geiger calls "poisonous," demanding the Jews be expelled from Worms, Frankfurt, and Regensburg "forever."[88] Undeterred, Reuchlin appealed to the emperor, claiming that his opponents weren't theologians; they were theologists. The Cologne crowd were all slanderers. According to Geiger, Reuchlin gave as good as he got. Reuchlin's bitterness drove him to repeat the scurrilous stories about Mrs. Pfefferkorn's reputed sexual relations with the Cologne Dominicans. In June 1513 the emperor imposed silence on all parties.

In July, the theology faculty at the University of Louvain rendered its verdict. Cologne and Louvain would later become centers of the anti-Lutheran movement, and both considered themselves defenders of the faith. The theologians of Louvain concluded that Reuchlin's *Augenspiegel* had numerous errors, casting into question the orthodoxy of its author and promoting the cause of the Jews; therefore, all remaining copies should be confiscated and burned. The Cologne Theology faculty concurred in August. The theologians of Mainz followed suit shortly thereafter. The *Augenspiegel* was to be consigned to the flames. The theologians at Erfurt, a bastion of the new humanism and soon to go over to the Reformed camp, demurred. They found the pamphlet full of errors, but Reuchlin was not guilty because

he never intended to publish it. The *Augenspiegel* was heretical, but its author was not a heretic, seemed to be their conclusion. In May 1514, a delegate from Cologne met with the theology faculty of the University of Paris to elicit their opinion. Louis XII, the French monarch, reminded the theologians there that St. Louis, his predecessor, had ordered the burning of the Talmud when he was king.

Recognizing the seriousness of the charges, Reuchlin employed a dual strategy to escape being burned at the stake. He engaged in a publicity campaign, enlisting the support of prominent writers like Erasmus and experienced publicists like Ulrich von Hutten, and he also waged a legal battle. He issued a public statement against "the Cologne slanderers" while pursuing a legal challenge to Mainz's jurisdiction over his case. He used the press to reformulate the issue from the dangerous charge of judaizing, redirecting it to the safer issue of academic freedom. Reuchlin portrayed himself as a learned preservationist who wanted to keep the obscurantists from consigning valuable historical documents to the flames. Reuchlin portrayed his battle with Pfefferkorn as a contest between "scholars, who respected books as cultural witnesses," against boors, who had no appreciation for them.[89] More specifically, "it pitted Reuchlin the humanist against Pfefferkorn and his supporters, the scholastic theologians of Cologne."[90] This implied that the study of ancient languages had priority over Aristotelian logic, which was a controversial assertion, but nowhere as controversial as the claim that Reuchlin was a Judaizer. Pfefferkorn and the Dominicans fought an uphill battle to portray themselves as the champions of orthodoxy fighting judaizing heretics because large segments of the intellectual establishment thought humanistic letters more palatable than scholasticism, which they disdained as moribund.

Reuchlin's strategy was apparent from the opening lines of his *Defensio Contra calumniatores suos Colonienses*: "their speech is rustic and barbarous; they are inexperienced in the Latin language and disgusted with humanistic studies."[91] Reuchlin launched an *ad hominem* attack on Pfefferkorn as someone "who is ignorant of theology and law, inexperienced in literature, and knowing no book written in the Latin language."[92] Although Pfefferkorn knew no Latin, his knowledge of Hebrew was superior to Reuchlin's, a charge Reuchlin attempted to deflect by saying Pfefferkorn, who was "equipped only with some childish, trite Jewish stuff undertook to write against me and published a slanderous book in German, full of invented charges."[93] That "trite Jewish stuff," though, was not insignificant: the discussion began as a dispute over the content of books written in Hebrew, books Reuchlin had apparently not read. Pfefferkorn then raised the bigger question, which had echoed unresolved throughout the Realist vs. Nominalist debate since before Huss: "Learning," Pfefferkorn replied, "is no defense against the charge of depravity. All the heretics are proof of this, for they were always the most learned men."[94]

As an integral part of his *ad hominem* attack on Pfefferkorn, Reuchlin rolled out one racial slur after another, referring to Pfefferkorn as "that Jew sprinkled with water."[95] Reuchlin and his humanist allies routinely referred to Pfefferkorn as the "*tauf iud*," a slur that simultaneously maligned Jews and the sacrament of baptism. The frequency of this slur indicated that the rise of racism in Europe and the decline of the Catholic faith, specifically skepticism about the efficacy of the sacraments, were one and the same thing. Gone were the days when the howling mob would chase the Jew to the baptismal font and then let him walk away unharmed through the very same mob, like Moses dry-shod through the Red Sea, after becoming a Christian.

Willibald Pirckheimer came to Reuchlin's defense in 1517, about the time Luther nailed his theses to the door in Wittenberg. An initial supporter of the Reformed cause, Pirckheimer became quickly disillusioned with Luther's ruthless politics and the pillaging of the monasteries for political gain; he returned to the Catholic faith. In defending Reuchlin, Pirckheimer mounted an attack on Pfefferkorn by casting doubt on the efficacy of his baptism, and by extension the sacrament itself, which was suddenly powerless when faced with racial characteristics deeply ingrained in Jews. To strengthen his case, Pirckheimer referred to recent events in Spain, which

> will serve as a warning to us not to trust in extemporized and feigned conversions. It would have been much better for the so-called marranos to stay with their native perfidy than to simulate true religion and be Judaizers in secret. For we had several examples of what we can expect from these inveterate sinners who have been badly converted. The emperor . . . wanted to indicate that converted Jews have as much in common with pious Christians as mice with cats.[96]

The humanists cheerfully joined forces to promote similar racial views. Pirckheimer is outraged that Pfefferkorn referred to Reuchlin as a "semi-Jew," but his outrage is purely racial. To Pirckheimer, the Jew is a function of his biology; and in this he agrees with the Jews who reminded Christ they were "*sperma Abraamu*." Pfefferkorn, though, innocently represented the traditional Catholic position by claiming that biology was irrelevant. The real issue, which the humanists tried to obfuscate and ignore, is that Reuchlin was a "demi-Jew" because of his judaizing positions, not because of his DNA. The humanists, prey to the racism that had just reared its ugly head, chose not to see things that way.

"Reuchlin's numerous friends," Graetz writes, referring indirectly to Pirckheimer, "were indignant at the insolence of a baptized Jew, who pretended to be more sound in faith than a born Christian in good standing."[97] Graetz's refusal to see the term "baptized Jew" as something of a contradiction in terms demonstrates that he shared the racial prejudices of the humanist establishment. Erasmus said of Pfefferkorn that "he could not have done a

greater service to his fellow believers [*sic*, i.e., the Jews], than by making use of the hypocritical ruse of becoming a Christian in order to betray Christianity."[98] "This half Jew," Erasmus continued, "has done more damage to Christianity, than the whole pack of Jews together."[99] Pfefferkorn was theologically correct to refer to Reuchlin as a "half-Jew" because of Reuchlin's judaizing, but Erasmus was guilty of nothing but racism when he leveled the same accusation against Pfefferkorn. He too was casting aspersions on the efficacy of the sacrament of baptism. "Now that he has put on the mask of the Christian, he truly plays the Jew. Now at last he is true to his race. They have slandered Christ, but Christ [*sic*, not] only. He raves against many upright men of proven virtue and learning."[100] This muddled racist thinking indicated a precipitous decline in the faith of the sort that would become manifest when the Reformation broke out a few years later.

In a letter to Pirckheimer, Erasmus said Pfefferkorn's actions show he is "a Jew and a half whom no kind of misdeed could make worse than he already is."[101] Erasmus then adds rash judgment to his offenses against Pfefferkorn, intimating Pfefferkorn "chose to be baptized for no other reason than to be in a better position to destroy Christianity, and by mixing with us, infect the whole people with his Jewish poison. For what harm could he have inflicted, if he had remained a Jew? But now that he has put on the mask of the Christian, he truly plays the Jew. Now at last he is true to his race."[102] The irony of intellectual lights like Erasmus supporting anti-Semitic Christian Judaizers was not lost on Pfefferkorn, the orthodox Jewish convert, and it saddened him.

Reuchlin continued his racial attack on Pfefferkorn throughout *Augenspiegel*, feigning outrage at how "that Jew, baptized with water, rose up in the church, a married layman before the congregation of faithful, that is, before the assembled church, and preached about the word of God and the Christian faith in an authoritative manner, he—a butcher and an ignoramus—blessed the people with the sign of the Cross."[103] Reuchlin's reference to Pfefferkorn as a "butcher" shows his familiarity with the slanders the Regensburg Jews had promoted against Pfefferkorn. The reference also shows that he was not averse to stooping to their level.

One commentator noticed "the irony inherent in the fact that [the Cologne Dominicans] supported Pfefferkorn, an ethnic Jew, while manifesting paranoid fear of all things Jewish."[104] But the irony is illusory: there is no contradiction. The Dominicans believed in the sincerity of Pfefferkorn's conversion, and as a result did not consider him a Jew. The humanists, though, had no qualms about casting aspersions on the efficacy of the sacrament of baptism, engaging in racial slurs, and throwing their lot in wholeheartedly with a Judaizer.

After Hoogstraten demanded that Reuchlin appear before the Tribunal in Mainz, Reuchlin panicked and tried to get the trial moved to the more sympathetic papal court at Speyer. He wrote in Hebrew to Bonet de Lates,

the pope's Jewish physician, asking him, who "moves daily in the private chambers of the pope and whose body is in his care,"[105] to influence the pontiff to remove the case from the jurisdiction of the Dominicans at Mainz. Both Geiger and Graetz consider the letter conclusive evidence that proves Reuchlin conspired with the Jews. "Had the Cologne contingent read the letter," writes Geiger, the milder and less ideological of the two Jewish historians, "then they would have had fresh ammunition added to their charge that Reuchlin was a Judaizer, because Reuchlin was even more fawning toward Bonet de Lates than the usual Hebrew epistolary style demanded. No German Christian had ever written to a Jew in terms like this before."[106] Reuchlin added that he had defended the usefulness of the Jews' books and so had drawn the hatred of the Cologne crowd. Reuchlin ended by saying that he did not fear a papal verdict, only being dragged into a court under the influence of the Dominicans.

Graetz confirms that Reuchlin had "secret intercourse with the rabbis."[107] He cites Reuchlin's letter in Hebrew to Bonet de Lates as an attempt "to win over Leo X so that the trial might not take place in Cologne or its vicinity, where his cause would be lost."[108] Reuchlin told Bonet de Lates in great detail "how only his extraordinary efforts had saved the Talmud from destruction" in a particularly damning fashion, even to someone like Graetz, who was heavily prejudiced in his favor. "Had the Dominicans been able to get a hold of and read this letter," Graetz says, "they could have brought forward incontestable proof of Reuchlin's friendliness towards the Jews, *for in it he wrote much that he had publicly denied.*"[109] Reuchlin, in other words, used his position on the commission to advance the cause of the Jews, and now he was citing this service in his letter to the pope's Jewish physician, and asking for payment—if not in money, then certainly in services. Given this frank demand for *quid pro quo*, Graetz finds it "natural that Bonet de Lates brought all his influence to bear in favor of Reuchlin."[110]

Bonet de Lates must have been especially effective. Reuchlin's case was transferred to the Bishop of Speyer in November 1513, and there Hoogstraten lost his case the following April. All charges of heresy against Reuchlin were dismissed; Hoogstraten was found guilty of slander and ordered to pay a fine or face excommunication. The Dominicans raged when the judgment was announced. When the verdict was announced in Cologne, Pfefferkorn ripped it from the wall and tore it into pieces.

Shortly after the verdict, Pfefferkorn responded with another pamphlet, *Sturm Glock* or Storm Warning or Storm Bell. In it, Pfefferkorn referred with retrospective satisfaction to the condemnation of *Augenspiegel* issued by the theology department of the University of Paris. He also left no doubt about the magnitude of the danger for the entire church that Reuchlin represented as the head of a new heretical movement. Pfefferkorn claimed Reuchlin was a new Huss, encouraged and paid for by the Jews, whose followers could do more harm to the church than any external enemy. Reuchlin was the real demi-Jew.

Reuchlin, the Judaizer, should be feared because from his movement would spill disorders that would make the Hussite wars of the 15th century look like a picnic by comparison."[111]

In response to *Sturm Glock*, Reuchlin published a self-serving anthology of letters of support he had received entitled *Clarorum virorum epistolae, Letters of Famous Men*, in which he predicted that when the scholastic theologians were done with him, they would "gag all poets, one after another."[112] Other humanists embraced Reuchlin's interpretation and began a letter-writing campaign to mobilize public opinion against the Dominican theologians.

If the humanists had left it at that, Reuchlin would have gone down in history as one more pompous, self-serving academic, but the humanists felt the cause too important to be left in the hands of an academic plodder. In 1515, Reuchlin's supporters brought out one of the most successful satires in the history of European letters, the *Epistolae obscurorum virorum*, a 16th century version of the *Screwtape Letters*, written in the pidgin Latin which the humanists loved to ascribe to their Scholastic opponents. Erasmus of Rotterdam, we are told, laughed so hard while reading the *Letters of Obscure Men* that an abscess of the throat that had plagued him burst, and he was cured of his ailment. The *Letters of Obscure Men* did for Reuchlin what the pompous plodder could not do for himself: the letters made him the victor in the first major publicity campaign since the invention of the printing press. *Letters of Obscure Men* also marked the beginning of the transition from the Humanist/Scholastic controversy to the Reformation.

Some claimed "the Jewish question" was not central to the *Letters of Obscure Men* and that its main purpose was to lampoon Scholastic dialectics as an outmoded relic of the dark ages, but the book's opening shot was directed at the Church's directives against Jews, in particular the Fourth Lateran Council measures to segregate Jews from Christians. "By the love of God!" Rubeanus wrote under the name Ortwin Gratius, the Cologne Dominican who was one of Pfefferkorn's most stalwart defenders. "What are you doing? Those fellows are Jews, and you have taken off your cap to them!"[113] Pseudo-Gratius grapples with whether he sinned by greeting Jews as if they were Christians. "For if I had known that they were Jews and had nevertheless taken off my cap, then I would deserve to be burned at the stake for heresy. But, heaven knows, I had no idea from anything they said or did that they were Jews. I thought they were Doctors."[114] To calm his conscience, Gratius confesses, "But when I went to confession in the Dominican monastery, the confessor told me that the sin was mortal because we must always be on guard, and he told me he could not absolve me, if he did not have an episcopal license, for it was a case for the bishop."[115] Gratius is finally absolved when he finds a confessor with "an episcopal license."

Pseudo-Gratius then moves on to the weightier theological issue of whether "when a Jew becomes a Christian, his foreskin, the part of his

member that is cut off at birth according to the Jewish law, grows back." He can't ask his fellow Dominicans because "they themselves are sometimes defective in that part," and so Gratius resolves "to establish the truth of this matter once and for all by asking Herr Pfefferkorn's wife."[117] Gratius made the mistake of responding to this fraternity house humor with a book of his own, *Lamentations of Obscure Men* (1518), but it had few readers and little impact other than to ensure that the book he attacked would remain in print for the next four centuries. A second edition of the *Letters of Obscure Men* appeared in 1516 with an appendix of seven new letters. The primary author of the additional material was Ulrich von Hutten, a talented poet and satirist. Emperor Maximilian crowned him poet laureate in 1517. An early supporter of Luther, he was prepared to use violence to assure the success of the Reformation. Hutten persuaded the equally volatile Franz von Sickingen to take part in the Pfaffenkrieg (the war against the priests), where the latter died in battle. Hutten then fled to the area around Basel and Zurich, where he died of syphilis in 1523, just as the Peasant Revolt was getting underway. Graetz refers to Ulrich von Hutten, in spite of his syphilis, as "the most energetic and virile character of the time" because he "was most eager to bring about the downfall of ecclesiastic domination in Germany."[118]

Graetz says the humanists had become "virtually a society" united behind the cause of Reuchlin in Western Europe "which silently worked for one another and Reuchlin."[119] It was "a struggle of the dark Middle Ages with the dawn of the better time" whose goal was "to destroy the Dominicans, priests and bigots and establish the kingdom of intellect and free thought, to deliver Germany from the nightmare of ecclesiastical superstition and barbarism, raise it from its abjectness and make it the arbiter of Europe."[120] With this goal in mind, the Reuchlin faction "involuntarily. . . became friends of the Jews and sought grounds on which to defend them." "Prominent Jews," likewise, "were working in Rome for Reuchlin, but, like the German Jews, they had the good sense to keep in the background so as not to imperil the cause by stamping it as Jewish."[121]

In July 1516 the majority of the commissioners confirmed the Speyer judgment acquitting Reuchlin. Formally, however, the decision was in the pope's hands. In a diplomatic move, he suspended proceedings, depriving Reuchlin of a clear victory but also frustrating Hoogstraten, who remained in Rome for another year before returning to Cologne in the spring of 1517. The situation was generally interpreted as a moral victory for Reuchlin, but by the time Hoogstraten returned from Rome, the Germanies had other things to think about. Luther had posted his 95 theses in Wittenberg and within seven years the empire's southern German speaking lands would witness a revolution so modern in form that the communists of the 20th century claimed it as their own.

Graetz thinks the Catholic Church was fatally undermined by the ridicule in the *Letters of Obscure Men*. The Church could not defend itself because "the whole tyranny of the hierarchy and the church" had been "laid bare. For, were not the Dominicans, with their insolent ignorance and shameless vices, the product and natural effect of the Catholic order and institution? So the satire worked like a corroding acid, entirely destroying the already rotting body of the Catholic Church."[122]

Graetz agrees with Erasmus that the legitimacy of the Church was also undermined by the rehabilitation of the Talmud. According to Graetz, "The discussion aroused by the Talmud created an intellectual medium favorable to the germination and growth of Luther's reform movement."[123] Erasmus supported the study of languages, including Hebrew, as a salutary antidote to Scholastic nit-picking, but he feared, nonetheless, that enthusiasm for language studies would create neo-pagan and judaizing movements in the Church.

Graetz best explains Reuchlin's ambivalent attitude toward the Jews and things Jewish when he says that Reuchlin spared the Talmud because of "his foolish fondness for the secret doctrine" it contained.[124] Graetz is referring specifically to Reuchlin's "love for the secret doctrine" of the Cabala, which he derived from "the most confused source of information," what Graetz refers to as "the foolish writings of the Kabbalist, Joseph Jikatilla, of Castile, which the convert Paul Reccio had lately translated into Latin": "Out of love for this secret doctrine, supposed to offer the key to the deepest knowledge of philosophy and Christianity, Reuchlin had wished to spare the Talmud because in his opinion it contained mystical elements."[125] Graetz can't quite bring himself to say it, but Reuchlin, the forerunner of the Enlightenment, spared the Jewish books because he wanted to learn magic from them. Graetz, who usually scorns the mumbo-jumbo of the Cabala, defends it in the case of Reuchlin because of the damage that Reuchlin and his "fondness for secret doctrine" did to the Church.

Willibald Pirckheimer, who spent time among the Reformed party before returning to the faith, identified himself as a friend of both Erasmus and Reuchlin. In 1517, he wrote a letter defending Reuchlin against the charge of bribery. "They," Pirckheimer writes, referring to Reuchlin's detractors, "are saying that he extorted gold from the Jews and was not ashamed to write many perverted things to do them a favor."[126] Pirckheimer defends Reuchlin in a series of rhetorical questions:

> What would have impelled such a Christian man to commit so great a crime, deigning to prefer the friendship of the Jews to faith and truth? Love for the Jews? Then he would indeed deserve to be hated. . . . What could have motivated him then to prefer the friendship of the Jews to the truth? They rightly ask what advantage, what wealth might have served

> as inducements that he should be so blinded by cupidity. After all, he is a man of advanced years, who has already enjoyed positions of honor, who was born from Christian parents—why then would be venture on such a shameful deed?[127]

Pirckheimer dismisses the possibility of a bribe because "the Jews in their innate avarice would not part with a great deal of money, and little would do him no good."[128] Pirckheimer might have changed his argument had he known that Jonathan Levi Zion was willing to spend 100 Gulden, in addition to an unspecified down payment, to bribe the Margrave of Baden. "Innate avarice" and bribery are not mutually exclusive. Jonathan Levi Zion mentioned Reuchlin's appointment to the commission in the same letter in which he brags about bribing the Margrave of Baden, but that is as far as the documentation takes us. Even if he took money from the Jews, the real reason for Reuchlin's defense of Jewish books was not money but Gnosis. Reuchlin wanted to become a magus, and the only way to that end was through the Cabala.

Reuchlin was a Judaizer, but he was certainly not a philo-Semite, which Graetz brings out in spite of his praise for Reuchlin. Reuchlin, according to Graetz,

> looked on the Jewish people as utterly barbarous, devoid of all artistic taste, superstitious, mean and depraved. He solemnly declared that he was far from favoring the Jews. Like his patron, Jerome, he testified to his thoroughgoing hatred of them. . . . Reuchlin no less than Pfefferkorn, charged the Jews with blasphemy against Jesus, Mary, the apostles and Christians in general; but a time came when he regretted the indiscreet lucubrations of his youth. For his heart did not share the prejudices of his head.[129]

The source of Reuchlin's ambivalence was his infatuation with the Cabala. Reuchlin, according to Geiger, was drawn willy-nilly into a relationship with the Jewish people, "because of the time he had spent studying the Hebrew language." Reuchlin was soon "beset on all sides with the accusation that the Jewish scriptures had taken root in his heart and turned him into a Judaizer."[130] Geiger feels that charge was unfounded because of Reuchlin's antipathy to the Jews. But Reuchlin also respected the Jews because they had preserved the Bible. The fact that his opponent was a baptized Jew only confirmed Reuchlin in his racial animus against Pfefferkorn's heritage. He wasn't unprejudiced enough to attribute the errors of his enemy to one man; he had to ascribe them to the entire race from whence he came.

Geiger's confusion is easily resolved. Reuchlin was both a Judaizer and an anti-Semite. Rummel feels Reuchlin reshaped the conflict into the humanist vs. scholastic debate as a kind of plea bargaining because he recognized, with the Dominican inquisitor at his heels and recent Spanish history fresh in

his mind, that judaizing was a charge that needed to be taken seriously and quashed quickly by shifting the debate. Reuchlin had reason to be fearful because

> the researches that had made him a paragon in the eyes of humanists also made him vulnerable to the charges of Judaism. His *Rudiments of Hebrew* (1506), a combination of grammar and lexicon, contained criticism of the traditional Vulgate text which was bound to raise the hackles of scholastic theologians. He had noticed discrepancies between the Hebrew text and the Vulgate translation, declaring that the translation was inferior, the translator "dreaming" or "blathering." In many cases he suggested improvements that were not merely idiomatic but changed the meaning. . . . By engaging in scriptural studies, Reuchlin was therefore entering dangerous territory.[131]

Part of Geiger's confusion stems from his refusal to look squarely at Reuchlin's rehabilitation of magic. Geiger, like Graetz, was a German Jew and devotee of the Enlightenment. Both men wanted to portray Reuchlin as a forerunner of the Enlightenment rather than what he was, namely, an enthusiastic supporter of Jewish magic. When Geiger said Reuchlin knew nothing about magic, he meant to say that he himself apparently wanted Reuchlin to know nothing about it because it ruined his portrayal of Reuchlin as the disinterested Enlightenment scholar. Reuchlin's ideas, Zika says, "can only be adequately understood as part of the occult tradition of the Renaissance. . . . This system promised new sources of knowledge and power, not through reason, but rather through magic, astrology, hermetic and gnostic thought, Cabala and Alchemy."[132]

Geiger claims Pico was interested in the writings of Plato, but what really fascinated Pico were the later neoplatonic texts, and what neoplatonism and Cabala had in common was gnosticism and magic. There is no Greek-Hebrew dichotomy. Pico was as avid to learn from the Hebrews as Reuchlin. He was not afraid to avail himself of Jewish teachers like Eliah del Medigo (a.k.a. Eliah Cretensis), Jehuda or Leo Abarbanel, and Jochanan Aleman, who taught him Hebrew and Cabala. Pico claimed he could derive from the Cabala proof for Christian teachings like the Incarnation of the Word, the arrival of the Messiah, and original sin. But his main interest was magic. Pico could start by studying the Chaldean and Pythagorean writers, but in the cases of Pythagoras and Moses, the written text wasn't sufficient. To get to the meat of the magic tradition, one needed the oral tradition through the Cabala and the Hebrew language. Pico claimed he used Cabala as an apologetic tool: "No science gives us more certainty about the divinity of Christ than Cabala and magic."[133] But this claim was most likely intended to placate the still dangerous and ever wary Inquisition. Reuchlin put the lessons he learned from Pico to good use in dealing with the Cologne Dominicans, assuring his critics that

by magic he meant "the knowledge of the properties of the heavenly bodies." The magic Reuchlin proposed was not the "forbidden art" found repugnant in others. It was, as Pico had indicated, a tool for Christian apologetics: "Cabala provides the weapon of choice against the Jews, who of course in their own way honor the Cabala but without having real insight into it."[135]

Pico convinced Reuchlin of the congruence between Pythagoras and the Cabala. What was the goal of each school? Nothing less than raising the human spirit to the level of God, to promote in him complete happiness. "The cabalist adept can enjoy the happiness of the blessed *in this life.*"[137] Unlike Zelivsky and the Hussites, who sought heaven on earth with the sword, Reuchlin sought it through esoteric knowledge or practical Cabala, *i.e.*, magic. Whatever the means, the end was the same. The attraction which cabalistic judaizing exerted over Reuchlin was the desire for heaven on earth.

The best defense being a good offense, Reuchlin published a book affirming his love of the Cabala in 1517 at the height of his controversy with Pfefferkorn and the Dominicans. Reuchlin's *De arte cabalistica* was dedicated to Pope Leo X. Reuchlin tried to establish the intellectual *bona fides* of cabalistic studies by associating them with Lorenzo de Medici, father of Leo X and patron of Ficino and Pico. "Your father," Reuchlin wrote in his dedication, "sowed the seeds of universal ancient philosophy which are now growing to maturity under your reign."[138] Reuchlin planned to build on the work of Lorenzo, Ficino, and Pico to "exhibit to the Germans a reborn Pythagoras, dedicated to your name."[139] However, he can only begin this monumental task by making use of Cabala, "for the Pythagorean philosophy has its origin in it, and with the memory of the roots being lost, it entered the books of the cabalists again via Greater Greece. . . . I have therefore written of the symbolic philosophy of the art of the Cabala to make Pythagorean teaching better known to scholars. But in all this I myself make no assertions; I merely recount the opinions of a third party. They are non-Christians; the Jew Simon, an experienced cabalist, who is on his way to Frankfurt, meets at an inn on the way a Pythagorean by the name of Philolaus the Younger and a Muslim by the name of Marranus."[140]

In his "*Teutsch missive*," Reuchlin claimed "only the learned Jew, who was practiced and experienced in the holy art known as Cabala," could understand sacred mysteries.[141] As a result of Reuchlin's book, Pope Leo X encouraged the publication of the same book that his predecessor Gregory IX had ordered burned. Times had indeed changed since Penafort introduced the Jewish convert Donin to Pope Gregory IX. The Dominicans of Cologne remained true to their traditions and gave unwavering support to Pfefferkorn, but the Medici popes no longer held the position of Innocent III and Gregory IX.

De verbo mirifico marked Reuchlin's immersion in the depths of the Cabala, but his Hebrew studies were only the means to a greater end. When he published *De arte cabalistica* in 1517, the controversy was winding down, and getting subsumed into the tumult of the Reformation. *De arte cabalistica*

is another dialogue between three men: a Jew, Simon, a Muslim, Marranus, and the Pythagorean Philolaus. The participants meet at the house of the Jew, who compares the discovery of the Caballah with the discovery of the magic herb Moly. Both can accomplish wonders; both are like a Jacob's ladder that unites heaven and earth, or creates a heaven on earth. "If you have found it," Simon says referring to Moly, "you seem to be freed from all misery." This magic herb is, next to the Cabala, "the Jacob's ladder, the golden chain or cord. This ladder stretches from the superheavenly world down to earth, and on it man ascends step by step from one level to another, just like the golden chain of Homer."[142] The key linking heaven and earth is the Hebrew names of the angels. Since the angels move the heavenly bodies, they can be ordered or beseeched to create wonders on earth. Magic is the word of God, but not in the sense that the Gospel is the word of God. We are talking about something more primitive. The word of God is literally the Hebrew tongue. Reuchlin quotes Pico: "each voice which has the power of magic in it, has it only insofar as it is formed by the word of God, only insofar as it has within it the power to exert original natural magical effects which come from the voice of God."[143] Simon the Jew informs his interlocutors "those who have mastered the Cabala give great honor to the 72 angels' names, and through them bring about wonderful things, more wonderful than I am permitted to describe."[144] The circular movement of the stars and planets is attributable to angels who move them, not to natural causes. Unusual motions in the heavens are attributable to the angels' free will.

Reuchlin is thus trying to use the Cabala as a bridge between God and man. Once he created this system, a new concept of religion would arise concentrated on becoming one with God through attainment of divine wisdom, which resembled Gnosis, activated through incantation and ritual. With the recovery of the Pythagorean-Cabalistic tradition, man has spectacular new powers that can work wonders and create a heaven on earth. In Reuchlin's system, man is no longer the pathetic suffering creature who finds in the Cross the best symbol of his life on earth; he now has the power to order angels, through the medium of theurgic Hebrew spells, to work wonders for him. Gnosis and magic give man the coercive power God exerts over nature. In studying the Cabala, and especially by learning the names of the angels who run the universe, Reuchlin attempts to achieve that gnostic mastery without falling into the trap of trafficking in fallen spirits. His system was an early conflation of magic and science that was doomed to failure. But it was a failure he could not see because the Hebrew scripture and the judaizing promises of heaven on earth that went with it blinded him.

De arte cabalistica confirmed the suspicions of Pfefferkorn and the Dominicans. Everything the *viri obscuri* had been saying about Reuchlin's judaizing was now confirmed in his own words. In 1519, Hoogstraten published "Destructio Cabalae," the counter-attack that exposed the agenda

behind Reuchlin's actions. *The Destruction of the Cabala* stressed the scholastic method, which, Hoogstraten said, "was the principal tool in the search for doctrinal truth. . . . Aspects of the faith which were not explicit in scripture or the apostolic tradition depended on deductive reasoning, that is, on the use of the logical argumentation characteristic of scholastic theology."[145] Hoogstraten effectively rebutted Humanists like Pirckheimer, who claimed the "true theologian. . . must understand Hebrew. . . because all the mysteries of the Old and New Testament are hidden in it."[146]

In *De verbo mirifico*, Reuchlin's first attempt to rehabilitate caballistic magic, Reuchlin had spoken as Capnion, the Greek form of his own name. In *De arte cabalistica* he speaks under a name that Hoogstraten finds especially telling. He calls himself Marranus, a play on the word Marrano, "the name of a man who on the surface proclaims his allegiance to one set of behavior, ceremony and teaching, but who inwardly practices something else."[147] Under the name Marranus, Reuchlin could praise Jewish perfidy and subvert Christian teaching, something hard to justify if he were a true Christian. By making Marranus his mouthpiece, Hoogstraten argued, Reuchlin was admitting publicly, albeit cryptically, his role as a judaizing subversive. By describing the Cabala as the "first revelation," which "Adam received after the Fall," Reuchlin undermined authentic scripture, and by making knowledge of the Cabala the *sine qua non* of theology, Reuchlin undermined both sacred and secular science.

Hoogstraten wasn't the only one who accused Reuchlin of using the Jewish Cabala to promote blasphemy and magic. The Jesuit Martin del Rio leveled precisely those charges, following the lead of Pedro Ciruello. Thomas Erastus condemned the book's advocacy of "repugnant magic."[148] Reuchlin lent credence to their charges by promoting a talisman, which he described in his book. On one side of the medal, Reuchlin prescribed the modified wonder-working Tetragrammaton IHSUH along with the seven astrological signs, and on the other side a star of David and various Hebrew signs. Reuchlin's recommendation of a standard instrument of Jewish magic was proof of his intention and his inspiration.

But by 1519, Germany had other things on its mind. Luther's actions and the rise of the Reformation destroyed whatever unity the "humanist" anti-Pfefferkorn/Dominican forces possessed. Luther was outspoken in his denunciation of cabalistic foolishness. Even though he was a friend of and avid correspondent with Reuchlin, Erasmus was of the same opinion when it came to Cabala.

Although Reuchlin thwarted Pfefferkorn's plans to burn the Talmud, Pfefferkorn and the Dominicans thwarted Reuchlin's plan to spread the Cabala. Reuchlin's cover was blown when he was placed on the commission and had to defend the Jewish books he found repugnant (as well as the repugnant Jews) to prevent destruction of the newly emerging esoteric science

that was mankind's new hope. As we have seen, Jakob Hoogstraten wrote *Destructio Cabalae* in 1519 as a warning to others, once he recognized the true magnitude of what Reuchlin was proposing. In his attack on the Cabala, Hoogstraten portrayed Reuchlin as a man who had acquired fame but brought forth only abuse and heresy, a man who falsified scripture, as well as Aristotle, Jerome and Dionysius, in the service of his occult theories.

Reuchlin was no philo-Semite, but he was a Judaizer. He was interested in Hebrew for the access that it gave him to occult science. Reuchlin restated Pico's thesis in the *Augenspiegel*: No art gave more certainty about divine things than Magic and Cabala.[149] Christianity enabled Reuchlin to derive from the Cabala a universal esoteric science which incorporated pagan, Jewish, and Christian elements, but once that esoteric science was derived it threatened to replace Christianity as the true religion. Reuchlin had proposed just this sort of syncretistic secret wisdom in *De verbo mirifico*.

Within a year of the appearance of Reuchlin's second book on the Cabala, Daniel Bomberg brought out the first complete edition of the Babylonian Talmud. Graetz describes a French pantomime in which a doctor with the name Capnion, Reuchlin's nickname, written on his back drops a bundle of sticks on the stage and departs. Another figure with the name Erasmus appears, tries in vain to ignite the sticks, and then departs. Luther succeeds, but after him the pope arrives and pours oil on the fire, making it bigger than ever. "Pfefferkorn and the Talmud," Graetz concludes, "should not have been missing in this dumb show, for they were the fuse that started the conflagration" that came to be known as the Reformation.[150]

Catholic writers like John Eck concurred, holding Reuchlin indirectly responsible for the *Letters of Obscure Men* as well as for Luther, thus establishing a connection between Reuchlin and the beginning of the Reformation. They also claimed that without the Jews, Martin Luther never would have come to the fore. The idea of Luther as the father of the Jews made its debut long before John Eck coined the term "Judenvater Luther."[151]

After 1519, most Reuchlinists became Lutherans. Erasmus, though, wrote to Reuchlin saying he regretted the Lutheran tragedy and had always tried to separate Reuchlin's cause from Luther's, an admission that shows how closely they were related in everyone's mind. Unlike Erasmus, who would become his opponent in a dispute over free will, Luther tried to link Reuchlin's cause to his own. Luther's supporters did likewise. Ulrich von Hutten wrote to Erasmus, pleading with him not to attack Luther in public thereby jeopardizing the cause of anti-Scholasticism. The Reformers should keep a united front in public, no matter what they thought privately. Hutten also wrote to Reuchlin reminding him "Even if your stated disapproval of Luther could rescue you from them, you cannot regard it as honest to oppose his party, when you see that men belong to it whom you must always support in a respectable cause, unless you want to be the most ungrateful man of all."[152]

Maximilian I, who gave Pfefferkorn the mandate to seize Jewish books, died in 1519. In May 1520, the papal court rendered the final verdict in the Reuchlin case: the acquittal was overturned, and Reuchlin was obliged to pay the court costs. In June 1520 Leo X signed the bull *Exsurge Domine* threatening Luther with excommunication. Reuchlin's scholarly reputation remained unimpaired, however. He accepted a position at the University of Tuebingen, where he taught Greek and Hebrew until his death in 1522. It is unknown whether Reuchlin paid the fine before he died. Maximilian's successor was Charles V, during whose reign the flame that Reuchlin kindled and Luther fanned to grew into a raging inferno in which "the Talmud and the Reformation were merged into each other."[153]

Pfefferkorn passed from the scene in 1521, one year before Reuchlin. In his unofficial last will and testament, *Ein mitleidliche Clag*, he held Reuchlin responsible for the revolutionary disorder sweeping Germany. Like the Jews, Reuchlin was a threat to the inner peace of the Germanies; the disorders which followed his judaizing could be construed as divine punishment, because "you have stolen God's honor and his good name, to cover up what you were doing with the Jews and the devil. Because of that you are not worthy to eat bread with dogs, much less consider yourself a member of the body of Christ. Instead you should take up your abode under the naked sky. Drawn and quartered on four stakes hammered into the ground: that would be your just deserts."[154]

Yet, even though another revolutionary movement took its place on the main stage of history, the occult tradition continued on the foundation Pico and Reuchlin had established. Cornelius Agrippa of Nettesheim published his ruminations on magic in 1533 as *De occulta philosophia*, inspired by Reuchlin's *De verbo mirifico*. Agrippa abandoned Reuchlin's professions of orthodoxy, returning instead to the medieval tradition of magic Reuchlin abhorred and repudiated. When Agrippa's book appeared, Reuchlin had been dead for 11 years. Gradually, people like Erasmus pulled back from their erstwhile allies in the fight against the *viri obscuri*, largely because they feared that magic, the occult, and its rituals threatened to "judiaize" Christianity."[155] Ultimately, Reuchlin was no humanist, but by the time Erasmus recognized that fact, it was too late to stop what Erasmus had unwittingly promoted.

John Dee, Elizabeth's astrologer, helped spread the Cabala and its occult practices to England, but it was only in the 17th century that Cabala studies were pursued with zeal. In England the enthusiasm for Cabala re-emerged on the other side of the Reformation as freemasonry. Albert Pike traces freemasonry to 1717. William Thomas Walsh claims it existed at the time of Elizabeth, who stumbled upon the first lodges and made a deal with the masons: if they would initiate her into their secrets, she would allow their secret society to continue. By tracing freemasonry to the Cecils and Elizabeth,

Walsh links it with the judaizing anti-Catholic conspiracy that swept Germany in the wake of the Reuchlin/Pfefferkorn controversy.

Cabala and freemasonry tend "toward spiritual perfection, and the fusion of the creeds and Nationalities of Mankind."[156] Freemasonry was linked with the Cabala, and Reuchlin had a place of honor in its annals. In his exoteric history of freemasonry, *Morals and Dogma*, Albert Pike claims "All truly dogmatic religions have issued from the Cabala and return to it; everything scientific and grand in the religious dreams of all the illuminati, Jacob Boehme, Swedenborg, Saint-Martin, and others, is borrowed from the Cabala; all the masonic associations owe to it their Secrets and their Symbols."[157] Pike echoes Reuchlin on the magical words of the Hebrew language. Once the adept, presumably the higher degree mason, penetrates "into the sanctuary of the Cabala," he discovers

> The necessary union of ideas and signs, the consecration of the most fundamental realities by the primitive characters; the Trinity of Words, Letters, and Numbers; a philosophy simple as the alphabet, profound and infinite as the Word; theorems more complete and luminous than those of Pythagoras; a theology summed up by counting on one's fingers; an Infinite which can be held in the hollow of an infant's hand; ten ciphers, and twenty-two letters, a triangle, a square, and a circle,—these are all the elements of the Kabalah. These are the elementary principles of the written Word, reflection of that spoken Word that created the world![158]

Chapter Nine

Thomas Muentzer and the Peasant Revolt

On October 31, 1517, Martin Luther sent 95 objections to the Catholic Church's doctrine on indulgences to Archbishop Albrecht of Mainz. According to legend, he also nailed the theses to the door of the Schlosskirche in Wittenberg. If so, the act must have attracted considerable notice among students at the University of Wittenberg, one of whom was Thomas Muentzer. Muentzer, whose name was sometimes Latinized to Monetarius, probably came from a family of coin makers or mint masters. His academic career shows his family valued education and had the means to support him. Muentzer probably studied at the University of Leipzig in 1506, enrolled at the University at Frankfurt in 1512, and then arrived in Wittenberg in 1517, just as the drama known as the Reformation began to unfold.

Muentzer was ordained a priest in Halberstadt before 1514. In Wittenberg, he immediately became a member of the reformed party, made up largely of disaffected clergy who would soon rip half of Germany away from the Catholic Church. When he finally got around to condemning his former disciple in his letter to the princes of Saxony, Luther claimed that he had sat across a table from Muentzer in Luther's room in the Augustinian cloister and punched him in the nose.[1] Muentzer denied the claim,[2] but he certainly made contact with Luther, his ideas, and his followers in the tumultuous semesters of 1517-18.

In Wittenberg, Muentzer met Andreas Bodenstein, later known as Karlstadt, Luther's colleague on the theology faculty, who urged Muentzer to steep himself in the writings of St. Augustine. He also met Luther's superior, Schwarzerd, who like Erasmus, classicized his name by rendering it into Greek, Philipp Melanchthon, the name by which he became known as Luther's right-hand man. Muentzer corresponded extensively with Melanchthon on topics ranging from infant baptism to marriage for priests long after the choleric Luther refused to have anything to do with him. More importantly, Muentzer met Franz Guenther, to whom Luther had given the task of leading the attack on scholastic theology in his theological baccalaureate thesis *Contra scholasticam theologiam*. A fiery preacher, Guenther confronted Tetzel when

he came to Wittenberg to sell indulgences. Soon the attack on indulgences was swept up into an attack on the Catholic faith with Guenther preaching "that we need not confess, because this is not commanded anywhere in the Scriptures. . . that we do not need to fast, because Christ fasted for us . . . that we should not call on the saints." The most brazen of Guenther's claims was "the Bohemians are better Christians that we are."[3]

Guenther's praise for Hussite heretics was too much for the Franciscan Bernard Dappen, who informed the bishop of Brandenburg in his *Contra Lutheranos* that Guenther, who was "shamelessly preaching the repudiation of indulgences, advised the women who had brought these indulgences to use them to fasten flax to their distaffs—as spinners usually do—so that they had not spent the money all in vain."[4] The Franciscans claimed the focus on abuses surrounding the sale of indulgences was a pretext for rebellion against Rome and a desire to overthrow Roman Catholicism.

When Guenther tried the same sort of preaching in the neighboring town of Jueterborg, he got himself in trouble with the authorities there. After personally insulting the abbess of the Convent of St. Mary from the pulpit, Guenther was reprimanded by the bishop. Rather than defy the bishop, Guenther withdrew from the pulpit, and Muentzer took his place, probably at the recommendation of Martin Luther himself, arriving at the cloister church of St. Mary's during Easter week of 1519. Instead of toning down his rhetoric, Muentzer picked up where Guenther left off. Like Jan Zelivsky one hundred years earlier, Muentzer had an uncanny ability to rile people up and then mobilize them politically.

Muentzer's sermons soon plunged Jueterborg into even greater turmoil. Muentzer attacked the pope and said that a council should be convened every five years. Muentzer also attacked the scholastics, bragging in a way that would prove uncannily prophetic that if anyone could prove him wrong, he "deserved to have his head chopped off."[5] Scholastic arguments about the rational underpinnings of faith and grace were, according to Muentzer, "of the devil."[6] He also attacked bishops and monks, calling the latter "misleaders of the people."[7] In Jueterborg, Muentzer was known as the first officially designated Lutheran. Muentzer also preached that sacramental confession was unscriptural, that fasting and veneration of the saints were unnecessary, and that previous Church councils were meaningless. Dappen was especially alarmed because the population of Saxony and Thuringia had already been infected by the Hussite virus and were therefore especially susceptible to revolutionary incitement. "I am completely certain," Dappen wrote to his bishop, "that if a Waldensian or a teacher of the Bohemian heresy were to come to this place and promote his errors and claim that they were the gospel of Christ, many would prick up their ears and listen eagerly."[8]

Given the reckless vehemence of his sermons, it is not surprising that Muentzer was banned from the pulpit, nor is it surprising that he was driven

from Jueterborg in May 1519. Thereafter, he was driven from every town where he was assigned as a preacher until his death six years later. Because the revolutionaries had the apparatus of the Church at their disposal, Muentzer spent little time unemployed. After Jueterborg, he was appointed curate of the parsonage in Orlamuenda, a sinecure that allowed him to study in depth the mysticism of the German Johan Tauler, a 14th century Dominican, and Heinrich Seuse. Kaspar Glatz, Muentzer's successor as pastor at Orlamuenda, would later say Muentzer was "corrupted"[9] by Tauler's teaching on the soul "which he never really understood."[10]

Muentzer had a profound understanding of the German mystical tradition because he had a profound understanding of the role suffering plays in the spiritual life. Commenting on Seuse's description of the angel with three pairs of wings in Ezekiel, Muentzer describes each as a representation of suffering that allows man to rise spiritually above his earthly condition. Suffering is to men what wings are to angels: "The three pairs of wings represent the following: "written on the first pair is 'accept suffering willingly.' On the second pair is written, 'Bear suffering patiently,' and on the third pair is written, "Learn to let suffering form you like Christ."[11]

Unfortunately, Muentzer was never able to integrate his spirituality with his increasingly violent revolutionary politics. Muentzer's thought was a curious mixture of the Cross and the sword until spring 1525, when he abandoned the Cross for the "sword of Gideon," his term for judaizing and the Hussite penchant for armed revolution. "Bohemia," he said in a sermon on Easter Sunday 1519, "is the land in which John Huss was active."[12] Reform would come from Bohemia again because "the Bohemians are better Christians than we are."[13] According to Ebert, the link between Guenther, Muentzer, and Bohemia, was "the utopian and millennialist expectations of the Taborites, including their forms of community and production and even their military strategy."[14]

Many Reformers idolized Huss. When Luther disputed with Johannes Eck in June 1519, he was reproached for believing "John Huss and the Bohemians are genuine evangelical Christians, which the Church cannot condemn."[15] Knowing that support for Huss would get him in trouble, Luther nevertheless could only dispute the claim half-heartedly. Later, when Luther was more open about what he believed, he regularly referred to Huss as a saint. When Muentzer later made his pilgrimage to Prague, he referred to Huss as "beloved and holy fighter."[16]

Shortly after the defeat of the Hussite army at the Battle of Lipany, Friedrich Reiser returned to Germany and became the leader of the Hussite communities there. He was consecrated a Hussite bishop and created a secret society, the League of the Faithful, to get the German Hussites and Waldensians to rise in armed revolution. Reiser was burnt at the stake in Strasbourg in 1458, but the communities he founded continued their revolutionary work throughout

the 15th century. Hussite propaganda, according to one commentator was "a disturbing factor in the rather unstable political and social structure . . . of southern Germany."[17] Macek claims "Hussitism struck roots in many places" in Germany[18] and "remained alive right up to the time of Luther and the German Peasant war."[19] In 1476, the shepherd and musician Hans Boheim (probably a variation on "Boehmen," which is to say, John the Bohemian) claimed the Blessed Mother appeared to him to announce that only in Niklashausen could one obtain full remission of sins. The Blessed Mother reputedly also told John the Bohemian, who was now known as the Piper of Niklashausen, that the greed of the clergy was greater than that of the Jews and that the Pope was a villain. The Blessed Mother told him all men were equal and no man should have more than any other. The message resonated with the peasants, presumably already corrupted by Taborite communism. Within months, thousands of peasants traveled to hear more of what the Blessed Mother was telling Boheim. Since no peasant could assemble without the permission of his lord, Boheim eventually was arrested. When Boheim's unarmed peasant supporters confronted the authorities over his arrest, the bishop's soldiers slaughtered them. Boheim was burned at the stake, singing Marian hymns in German until the flames suffocated him. For many historians, 1476 is considered the beginning of the Peasant Revolution.[20]

During the winter of 1519-20, Muentzer became confessor to the nuns at the convent at Beudiz, where his nominal duties again allowed ample time for study. In addition to reading the German mystics, Muentzer also purchased the Chronicles of Eusebius and the Jewish Wars by Josephus and the acts of the Council of Constance. His interest in the Council of Constance was understandable: Muentzer wanted to know more about the Church's condemnation of Huss. What he learned probably filled him with indignation. What Muentzer gleaned from reading about the Jews, in particular about their revolutionary activities in the classical world, is not as clear. Did he take the stories of Simon bar Kokhba and the Jewish revolutionaries at Masada as cautionary tales, a warning that those who lived by the sword would die by the sword? Probably not, for Muentzer lived and died by the sword. One of Muentzer's biographers says he pored over the acts of the Council of Constance to uncover the historical cause for the decline of the Church. More probably, Muentzer's promiscuous readings simply exacerbated his "existential bewilderment."[21] One biographer claims Muentzer "had not yet matured into the reformer who, in Manfred Bensing's opinion, began to see the Reformation as 'the fundamental remodeling of earthly life and hence as a revolution.'"[22]

Reading German mystics and classical accounts of Jewish revolutionaries could lead to no synthesis because they represented two poles of an irresolvable spiritual dichotomy represented by the sword on the one hand and the Cross on the other. The Cross symbolized the passive expiatory suffering of Christ

that inaugurated the New Covenant and the thousand year reign of Christ on earth, whereby Christians conquered the Roman Empire by turning the other cheek, which is to say, by patient endurance in uniting their suffering with that of Christ. The sword symbolized the Jewish rejection of the suffering Christ and the choice of revolution instead. By taking up the sword, Jewish revolutionaries, and their judaizing Christian imitators, hoped to establish heaven on earth. The sword thus, one way or another, symbolized abandonment of the freedom of the gospel and return to the bondage of the law. Muentzer may have hoped to create a synthesis between German mystics and Jewish revolutionaries, but he ignored the scriptural admonition about sewing new patches on old garments. There was no way to reconcile the sword and the Cross.

After months of filling his mind with dangerous ideas, Muentzer complained to Franz Guenther about the isolation inherent in his position as confessor to a group of nuns in an out of the way convent. Muentzer longed to get back into the political disputes, and before long he got his wish. In May 1520, he became a substitute preacher at St. Mary's, the most important church in Zwickau, when its pastor, Johannes Sylvius Egranus, took a leave of absence to study with Erasmus in Rotterdam.

Astride the road connecting Leipzig with Augsburg and Nuremberg, Zwickau had grown famous for its cloth and beer, and prosperity soon followed, bringing with it all the conflicts that would tear apart Christendom at the crucial divide between the late middle ages and the early modern era. The serious money in Zwickau, however, came from mining in the nearby Erzgebirge. When the Schneeberg silver mine went into production in the latter part of the 15th century, the families who invested in it became fabulously wealthy. The metal-working artisans did well too, and the population of Zwickau doubled to 7,500, making it, behind Leipzig, the second largest town in the region. Frederick the Wise referred to Zwickau as the pearl of his realm. Having more silver than they knew what to do with—it often lay around in boxes waiting to be coined or worked into plate—brought problems. The families who grew rich through silver mining invested in the cloth business, stockpiling stores, and undermining the cloth-producing guilds. Nikolaus Storch, a weaver, was one of the economic losers; he used his newfound time as an unemployed weaver to study the reformed gospel while becoming a leader of the town's disgruntled weavers. The miners were similarly unhappy. Soon both groups, falling under the influence of the nearby Bohemian Taborites, were spouting communist theories and engaging in riots and public disturbances.

There was no lack of Catholic social welfare agencies in the town, staffed by nuns, priests, brothers, and laymen who contributed to the town's vibrant social life. But the Church's social welfare apparatus could not keep up with increasing economic division between rich and poor, which fueled envy

and resentment among those left behind. The increase in the money supply drove up prices. but wages did not keep pace. Once-prosperous weavers were out in the cold when the cloth industry was taken over by middlemen who warehoused the cloth and manipulated prices. The monasteries and convents that had accumulated land over the centuries remained wealthy while the weavers' fortunes declined. This caused envy and class conflict; it also induced people to join the monasteries for other than spiritual motives.

If the situation was the social equivalent of dry tinder, then Muentzer's nascent revolutionary theology and preaching was the match that set off the conflagration. He began his preaching in Zwickau with an inflammatory attack on the Franciscans. The monks, he said, had such fat mouths that you could cut a pound of meat from them and still have plenty left.[23] Egranus' return from Rotterdam did little to calm the situation; he was soon drawn into the conflict. Muentzer criticized Egranus as a humanist dilettante. Luther sided with Muentzer, calling Egranus a theological illiterate.[24]

Luther was having troubles of his own. In June 1520, Pope Leo X issued the bull *Exsurge domine* excommunicating Luther. In May 1520, Reuchlin's acquittal was overturned in Rome, handing victory to Pfefferkorn and the Dominicans. The tide was turning against the Reformers, whose leader, Luther, had grown a beard and gone into hiding under the name Junker Joerg.

Two months after his fat mouth sermon, Muentzer was still fighting with the Franciscans, which he dutifully reported in a letter to Luther. When not insulting monks, Muentzer kept insisting on a more "spiritual" Christianity, as opposed to the external rituals that were the cultural lifeblood of the town. Muentzer had the annoying habit of ascribing to God the effects of his intemperate sermons and reckless behavior: "It is not my work," he said repeatedly, "that I am doing, but that of the Lord."[25] His inflammatory words soon led to violence. The cloth-workers were emboldened by his preaching and took their demands to the town council. Local artisans attacked followers of the anti-Reformation pastor Nikolaus Hofer, pelting them with mud and animal dung, driving them from town. Evidently gratified by the results, Muentzer redoubled his attacks on "the godless clergy," *i.e.,* the mendicants and those who supported Rome and its liturgical system.

By October 1520, the situation had become intolerable. The secular and ecclesial authorities sought to remove Muentzer from the pulpit at St. Mary's. The move backfired when Muentzer took up residence at the working class parish of St. Catherine's, where he made alliance with the town's weavers, the backbone of the revolutionary movement in Zwickau. Clothmaking and dyeing was Europe's first industry, and, fittingly enough, the clothmakers' guilds constituted Europe's first revolutionary proletarian *avant garde*, beginning in the Low Countries in the high middle ages, through the Peasant Revolt and the Anabaptist commune in Muenster, and continuing to the essentially Puritan theocracy in England. When Muentzer made contact

with the weavers, his revolutionary fervor increased. Crucial to Muentzer's formation as a revolutionary was the déclassé weaver Nicholas Storch, who led a group, the Zwickau Prophets, at the revolutionary heart of the weavers' guild. It is impossible to say who had greater influence on whom. Muentzer was never an avid proponent of Luther's *sola scriptura*, which he later derided as relying too greatly on the dead letter of the law. Unlike Luther, Storch was the prime example of the living word of God because he had direct revelations from God in dreams and visions. Some claim Muentzer was seduced by Storch's enthusiasm. If so, Muentzer was avid for seduction. Muentzer craved revelations and spiritual experiences that vindicated his position, and in Storch he found vindication in abundance. Storch, who "boasted of secret divine revelations and had caused considerable disturbance"[26] with his enthusiasm, was the antithesis of the scholastic theologians. The simple, unlettered, uneducated layman relied not on philosophy or human reason but on direct instruction from God. The minute he opened Holy Scripture, the Holy Ghost spoke through him.

Luther was unimpressed with the Zwickau Prophets. Storch had approached Melanchthon with questions about infant baptism; Melanchthon then met with Junker Joerg only to find Luther considered Storch "driven by a thoughtless spirit."[27] It was a mild rebuke given Luther's penchant for verbal aggression, but Luther was clearly troubled by the direction his "allies" were taking. The Zwickau Prophets were talking about abolishing all social differences: "Wouldn't it be a wonderful thing," they wrote, "if every man were equal and all belonged to the same class, and everything was put to common use, and no one had to be subject anymore to the Rat King? Who needs those horny, phony clerics? Those fat stallions need to be done away with."[28] The Zwickau Prophets were also talking about abolishing marriage, which "contradicts the nature of man and God's plan for nature as well."[29] It was as if the Taborites had come back to life one hundred years later in Zwickau. Luther was less than happy, no doubt partly because he needed the princes to protect himself and his Reformation from the pope and emperor. The Anabaptist theology that poked its head above ground in Zwickau would reach full bloom in 1534 when the weavers took over Muenster, but Luther saw trouble on the horizon already. After Zwickau, Muentzer saw himself no longer as a Roman Catholic priest, but, like Storch, an Old Testament prophet answerable to God alone. He would to destroy the existing corrupt Church and replace it with a purified assembly of the elect, who would wield the sword as their dreams and visions dictated, just as Joshua and Gideon had in Israel.

Muentzer again forced the hand of the town council, which expelled him from Zwickau on April 16, 1521, the same day Luther arrived in Worms to defend himself before the Imperial Diet against charges of heresy. Muentzer's contemporary Joachim Zimmerman made invidious comparisons between

him and Luther, claiming that on the same day that Muentzer set off a riot in Zwickau and then slipped out of town in the middle of the night, Luther, "well-aware of Huss's death by fire," rode into Worms to be greeted reverently by a thousand-strong crowd, to defend his belief before the Emperor and the estates for "the sake of his soul's salvation.'"[30] The implication is that the Wittenberg Reformer was a hero and the Zwickau preacher a coward.

Zimmerman's sermon was an indication that the Reformation had already split into two factions: Muentzer, whose views led to revolution, anarchy, communism, and the belief that the governed had a right to say who governed them, on the one hand, and Lutheran authoritarianism on the other. Luther needed the military might of the princes to move his program forward and was willing to buy them off with Church property to get it. If Luther had not defied the Emperor with his famous *mot, "Hier stehe ich, ich kann nicht anders*," the princes, who were his protectors and whom Luther represented, would have murdered him on the spot. His interpretation of Romans 13 proposed tyranny as the alternative to Muentzer's anarchy; once the peasants had been defeated, that tyranny established the groveling German attitude toward authority that found its culmination in the Third Reich.

After his expulsion from Zwickau, Muentzer traveled through the secret Hussite communities of southern Germany, eventually penetrating to the dark heart of heretical and revolutionary thought when he arrived in Prague in June 1521. At the gates of the city, Muentzer was greeted by a torchlight parade; it was the custom "to escort renowned preachers and scholars with anticipation and festivity."[31] Muentzer was received with honors because he was viewed as a representative of Luther, whom the Praguers viewed as the latest avatar of the Bohemian martyr John Huss. Even though in the coming months he would become Luther's bitter enemy and must have already descried clouds on the horizon of their relationship, Muentzer did nothing to discourage the impression he was "*emulus Martini*,"[32] as the inscription on the back of Melanchthon's theses described him, because the Utraquists had already placed the mantle of Huss on Luther's shoulders. Luther would disappoint them, but, for the present, they put the town's pulpits at the disposal of the man they considered Luther's disciple.

Muentzer preached at the Teyn Church, the Corpus Christi chapel, and, predictably, at the Bethlehem Chapel where Huss had preached. He preached in German to the town's largest foreign language majority, in Latin at the university, and in Czech with the help of translators to the average man. Even though he issued no overt call to arms, the reaction to Muentzer's preaching in Prague was not unlike the reaction in Jueterborg, Orlamuenda, and Zwickau. Two weeks after his arrival, after a memorial service for Huss, an enraged mob stormed and looted a local monastery.

The Prague Manifesto is a summation of what Muentzer told the Hussites. Published in 1521, probably after he was expelled from Bohemia, the Manifesto

explained he went to Prague because it was "the city of the precious and holy martyr Jan Hus," and because he hoped "the loud and moving trumpets [that once sounded in this city]" would sound throughout the whole church and remove the corruption, about which he "lamentingly complain[ed]."[33] Suffering is necessary to purify the elect, who are synonymous with the Church, which they will purify. But Muentzer was not promoting suffering as the surest means to sanctity; he was promoting an experiential religion that denied the necessity of faith. "The word of God," he wrote, "penetrates the heart, brain, skin, hair, bones, limbs, marrow, [and] fluids, [with] force and power," and "he who has once received the holy spirit as he should, can no longer be damned."[34] In other words, once a man has the right experiences he is saved: "an experienced faith is one that is certain of salvation."[35]

That formulation must have given Luther pause because it undermined *Sola Fide*, one of the three pillars of the Reformation. Once Luther broke with the apostolic Catholic Church and its sacraments and made faith the foundation of religion, it was a very short time before those who accepted the principle asked, "How do we know we have faith?" In Muentzer's view, the only possible answer was "because we have experienced faith." This transformed Christianity into a religion of experience. In typically judaizing fashion, Muentzer based his idea that Christians "should all have revelations"[36] on the Old Testament, but he did so while attacking "the Jewish, heretical parsons," who "say that such a strong thing is not necessary for salvation," prompting Baylor to explain, "in describing the clergy as Jews, Muentzer intended to call attention to the scriptural literalism and legalism, which he equated with the practices of Jewish scribes."[37]

Meditating on John Huss led Muentzer to additional conclusions. Muentzer pored over the Book of Daniel and concluded the papacy was the "fourth Beast." Conflating Rome and the Roman Church, Muentzer concluded the end of the old world was nigh; Muentzer, the New Daniel, as he would deem himself three years later, would bring about the thousand year reign of Christ on earth by reforming a terminally corrupt Roman Catholic Church. Only the Elect would be members of the reformed Church, and they would know they were the elect because of their experience of being saved. German mysticism now took a turn toward the eschatological; eschatological thinking, when widespread throughout the southern German speaking lands, would have revolutionary political consequences. The clergy who opposed the New Daniel's vision of the Church were dismissed as "thin-shitters" and "whoremongers."[38]

Muentzer was preaching a different gospel than his reputed mentor Luther. Muentzer's Prague Manifesto not only undermined *Sola Fide*, it also undermined *Sola Scriptura*. "All true parsons," Muentzer wrote, "must have revelations so that they are certain of their cause."[39] Muentzer attacked the scholastic notion that reason provided a prolegomena to faith and that faith

perfected reason. "It is not reason," Muentzer wrote, "which explains to man the meaning and purpose of history, but rather a theology, which orients itself on the living word of God, whose witness he discerns in the heart." Even this subversive thought is not enough for the man Luther would deride as a "*Schwaermer*," or enthusiast. "The sheep," Muentzer continues, "should be led to revelations."[41] If the preacher does not have revelations, the gospel ceases to be the living word of God and becomes a dead letter. Luther, to his credit, realized breaking from the objective word of God was a recipe for social anarchy. Muentzer was leading the newly reformed faithful into a world where preachers, led by their own phantasms, would inspire each member of the flock to follow his own phantasms, creating a world where every man is his own visionary.

Luther did not understand, though, that he got this ball rolling when he broke with the Church, undermining its authority as guarantor and interpreter of Scripture. Luther's Catholic contemporaries were more clear-sighted. Johannes Cochlaeus held Luther responsible for the Peasant's Revolt, even though Luther urged the princes to crush it, because Luther prepared the way by eliminating the Church as the guarantor of the Scripture and the legitimate basis for social order. Luther, "the seducer of the people,"[42] was horrified by Muentzer's actions because in them he saw his own principles carried to their logical conclusion. But Luther "was much more pernicious than Muentzer," because the latter only spread revolution in Thuringia, whereas Luther "spread it through every land of the German nation."[43]

Luther was a philo-Semite, who in a few years would become a violent anti-Semite, but he was also a Judaizer *malgré lui*. Luther did for Christianity what Jochanan ben Zakkai did for Judaism: he turned the evangelical Church into a debating society, in which the evangelical rabbis would offer competing interpretations of scripture with no way of adjudicating differences other than splitting off from whomever one disagreed with. Luther would ultimately solve the problem of competing interpretation and competing authority in the same way Jan Zizka did earlier in Bohemia and Oliver Cromwell and Stalin did later, which is to say, by *force majeure*. Like Zizka, Luther used military might to end the debate over doctrine. Two and a half centuries later, Friedrich Nietzsche, the son of a Lutheran pastor, would distill the lessons of Protestantism and Revolution into one distinct phrase: will to power.

But all of that was in the future, and Muentzer most certainly did not see the future clearly when he said of the Bohemians, "I do not doubt the people." He clearly hoped that revolution would once again rise up "in your land and afterward everywhere," i.e., in Bohemia and then spread to the German speaking lands to the north and west.[44] The people, if by that phrase we mean the Bohemians, soon had their doubts about Muentzer and expressed them in an unambiguous fashion when they placed him under house arrest and then deported him back to Thuringia at the end of 1521.

When he left Prague, Muentzer believed the world was coming to an end, especially the world that began with what might be called the thousand year reign of Christ inaugurated in Europe by the Rule of St. Benedict. Karlstadt led the mob in Wittenberg to an orgy of image breaking in December 1521, forcing Luther to abandon the safety of the Wartburg to confront a disciple who was taking matters into his own hands. In 1522, Reuchlin died; Erasmus wrote his "Apotheosis of Reuchlin," describing the cabalist's entry into heaven and defending him against those he called "pseudoapostles plotting . . . to obscure his glory."[46] By the 1520s, the term "pseudoapostles" was part of the polemical rhetoric of the Lutherans, "whose movement was now threatening the unity of the church." Erasmus thus found himself in a dispute neither to his liking nor of his own making. During the 1520s, many humanists who had defended Reuchlin became Lutherans, and Erasmus was caught in the same upside, as the popular witticism, "Erasmus laid the egg, and Luther hatched it," made clear.[46]

Luther had supported Reuchlin early in his struggle against Pfefferkorn and the Mendicants. Luther's attitude toward Reuchlin was dictated not so much by principle as by opportunism. Luther did not share Reuchlin's enthusiasm for Jewish literature or Cabala. In fact, he passionately condemned what he referred to as cabalistic foolishness, but defended Reuchlin because of similarities between Reuchlin's case and his own. In letters to Erasmus, Luther urged a common front among humanists, even though he was not one, as Luther's champion Ulrich von Hutten also urged in his letters to Erasmus. Both men knew the times had changed since Nicholas Donin. The Humanists were partially responsible for that change, and Luther allied himself with them to benefit from the change. Luther was committed neither to the humanist's promotion of Latin and Greek nor to Reuchlin's promotion of Hebrew; he was, however, a devout follower of the principle that the enemy of my enemy is my friend.

By siding with Reuchlin, Luther became a friend of the Jews. The alliance was based more on opportunism than principle. In his tract "Jesus Christ was born a Jew" (1523), Luther defended Jewish liberties to effectuate his larger goal of undermining the Catholic Church. Like the Puritans after him, Luther thought once the gospel was preached correctly, free of papist distortions, the Jews would convert in droves. "Those fools, the papists, bishops, sophists, and monks," Luther wrote, "have hitherto so dealt with the Jews. If I had been a Jew and received such treatment. . . I'd rather have been a pig than a Christian."[47] When it was apparent 20 years later that the Jews were not going to convert to Luther's version of Christianity, Luther wrote "On the Jews and their Lies," in which he urged German princes to destroy their synagogues and burn their books, a far harsher regimen than Pfefferkorn had promoted and against which Luther had expressed much indignation. Luther also recommended that all young able-bodied Jews be impressed into forced labor

gangs to perform menial tasks like removing manure from the streets. In his disappointment, Luther went far beyond the measures the Catholic Church proposed to deal with the Jews.

Graetz studiously ignores all this when he deals with the Reformation in his *History of the Jews*. He apparently shared Luther's view that the enemy of his enemy was his friend. Graetz supports the Reformation because he sees it as bringing Enlightenment to North Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Prussia, Poland, France and "even Spain, the country of the darkest and most bigoted ecclesiasticism and the home of persecution."[48] Walsh and Graetz mention Elias Levita, "another Jew who did valiant spade work for Luther's sowing."[49] When Luther translated the Bible into German, he, of necessity, relied on Jewish scholars. "For his purpose," Graetz writes, "Luther had to learn Hebrew, and seek information from Jews."[50] Rabbi Solomon, later known as Raschi, became the conduit for his father, Isaac of Troyes, who exerted influence on the reformers through a Franciscan monk of Jewish descent by the name of Nicholas of Lyra. Luther, Calvin, and Zwingli acknowledged Nicholas's influence. Add to that Sforno's influence on Reuchlin, and it becomes understandable how one Jewish writer would claim the Reformation "drew its life blood from rational Hebraism."[51]

In making *Sola Scriptura* a pillar of the Reformed Faith, Luther also continued what Reuchlin began, by demoting scholasticism and promoting the study of language in general and Hebrew in particular. The Jews later promoted the Reformed cause by printing Protestant Bibles based on unapproved and erroneous translations and arranging for their clandestine transport throughout Europe. The Jews became spies and propagandists for the Reformers, trafficking in corrupted translations of the Bible taken from Jewish scriptures:

> The most active intelligencers, liaison officers and propagandists of this international army were Jews. Only four years after Luther's first outburst, Cardinal Alexander, papal nuncio, reported that Jews were printing and circulating the German monk's books in Flanders. From the Netherlands they sent Bibles even to Spain, concealed in double-bottomed wine-casks. In Ferrara, a great Jewish financial center, they printed heretical Bibles for distribution in Italy and elsewhere. No less a person than Carranza, now languishing in the prisons of the Inquisition in Spain, said that this was the reason why the Church had to discourage the reading of the Bible in the vernacular, saving in approved versions. Even Jewish physicians and men of business were spies and propaganda agents. In the very year after Philip returned to Spain to stamp out Protestantism there, the Jewish Doctor Rodrigo Lopez, who was to find so unhappy an end in England, was passing over from Antwerp to London as a good Protestant.[52]

Although Graetz and Walsh agree on the role Jews played in the Reformation, they disagree in evaluating that role. Graetz sees the Reformation as the precursor of Enlightenment. Walsh views it as "one long retrogression toward the moribund Judaism of the Pharisees of the time of Christ."[53] The Reformation was not a movement from darkness to light but rather disaffected clerics, oftentimes practicing the very abuses they decried in others, returning like dogs to the vomit of Judaism. Calvin declared the prohibition against usury outdated, not because it was no longer a source of social pathology, but rather, to cite Graetz, because "the interest of the marketplace had driven the interest of the church into the background."[54] Walsh describes the Reformation as "the great betrayal" that allowed the moneychangers back into the Temple, after "they had been ousted by the medieval Church when she was most free and vigorous."[55] Unsurprisingly "most of the heresiarchs and heretics of this present century," according to Cabrera, were seen as Jews. "It is beyond question," Walsh continues, citing a Jewish historian, "that the first leaders of the Protestant sects were called semi-Judaei, or half-Jews, in all parts of Europe, and that men of Jewish descent were as conspicuous among them as they had been among the Gnostics and would later be among the communists."[56]

Luther hitched his fortunes to Reuchlin, who had promoted the Talmud. "We," Graetz writes, "can boldly assert that the war for and against the Talmud aroused German consciousness and created a public opinion without which the Reformation, like many other efforts would have died in the hour of birth, or perhaps would never have been born at all."[57] Graetz similarly portrays the Reformation as "the triumph of Judaism,"[58] a claim that many Catholics made in Luther's day. Graetz applauds Luther's early defense of the Jews, especially when Luther urges Christians to "show them a friendly spirit, permit them to live and to work, so that they may have cause and means to be with us and amongst us,"[59] describing Luther's sentiments as words

> which the Jews had not heard for a thousand years. They show unmistakable traces of Reuchlin's mild intercession in their favor. Many hot-headed Jews saw in Luther's opposition to the papacy the extinction of Christianity and the triumph of Judaism. Three learned Jews went to Luther and tried to convert him. Enthusiastic feelings were aroused among the Jews at this unexpected revulsion, especially at the blow dealt the papacy and the idolatrous worship of images and relics; the boldest hopes were entertained for the speedy downfall of Rome and the approaching redemption by the messiah.[60]

Walsh claims the "stormiest preachers" of the Reformation were "of Jewish descent."[61] Michael Servetus, the first Unitarian, was influenced in his attack on the Trinity by Jews. Calvinism became a "convenient mask"[62] for Jews in

Antwerp after their expulsion from Spain, confirming that Protestants were half-Jews and adding to the suspicions of Catholic leaders.[63]

In March 1523, Muentzer became pastor at the Church of St. John in the New Town section of Allstedt, where he would remain until he was again forced to leave his flock in the middle of the night in August 1524. In Allstedt, Muentzer created the first vernacular German liturgy. It was in Allstedt that he developed his revolutionary theology and an organization, the League of the Elect, to carry it out. It was in Allstedt that he made contact with the miners from Mansfeld, his most ardent supporters. And it was in Allstedt that he broke his vow of celibacy.

On March 22, 1522, Muentzer wrote to Melanchthon explaining why he did not plan to take a wife. He also explained he had no objection to other priest Reformers marrying, which they were doing with increasing frequency, often with nuns liberated from convents sacked by Iconoclasts. The most prominent defector from the vow of celibacy was Luther himself, who admitted to being a "famous lover,"[64] was accused of drunkenness and whoremongering, and was treated for syphilis before he eventually married a nun, Catherina von Bora, who had been "liberated" from her convent by a group of Reformers on Holy Saturday of 1523.

Muentzer's letter to Melanchthon is ambivalent. He applauds the theology Melanchthon has apparently confected to justify breaking the solemn vow of celibacy and getting married because "it has liberated many souls of the elect from the snares of the hunters."[65] He approves of "your priests taking wives, so that the Roman mask [of false piety] does not continue to oppress you,"[66] because he can find no scriptural basis for celibacy. An added benefit is that the children of the union of Reformed priests and nuns would "belong to the Elect from the moment of their birth."[67] Allowing priests to marry would thus provide the foundation of the church of the future. He bases this claim on Isaiah 65:20, which he claims says these children will see a new heaven and a new earth.

But after conceding all this, Muentzer does an abrupt about face and claims just as vehemently that marriage is not for him. He condemns in practice the very thing he just allowed in principle, telling Melanchthon that "with your counsel" the Reformers are dragging "people to marriage, even though the marriage bed is no longer an immaculate one but a whorehouse of Satan, which damages the church as severely as the most damned oils of the priesthood."[68] Muentzer concludes that Melanchthon can't solve the celibacy problem because he can't comprehend the "living word of God." He also announced the end of the world, claiming that "the time of the third angel has already dawned."[69]

Within a year, Muentzer changed his mind abruptly. On July 29, 1523, Muentzer ended a letter to Andreas Karlstadt, another priest professor from the university at Wittenberg, by conveying greetings to Karlstadt's wife. He

added, "I am oriented to God in the original rigor,"[70] meaning he was still adhering to the vow of chastity. Yet by August, Muentzer married a liberated ex-nun of noble birth, Ottilie von Gerson. The marriage certainly caused scandal in Allstedt among those who were not of the Reformed party. One biographer says Muentzer "openly married"[71] the runaway nun at the end of July. The interval between the marriage and the arrival of their first child indicates their relations began before the wedding. Like many of his priestly peers, Muentzer was caught in a web of conflicting vows. For Luther, this moral contradiction led to the doctrine of the enslaved will. For Muentzer, it led to revolution.

But not directly. During summer 1523, enough revolutionary monks and their runaway nun concubines arrived in Stolberg to generate a revolutionary situation, which Muentzer addressed in his Open Letter to the Brothers at Stolberg. Muentzer began by explaining the efficacy of patient suffering, but he concluded by giving tacit approval, couched in negative terms, to revolution. Since he warned the brothers to shun "unjustifiable" or "inappropriate" revolution,[72] the perceptive reader saw Muentzer's letter as justifying "appropriate" revolution. The question became, "Is this particular revolution justifiable?" Unlike Martin Luther, Catholic theologians like Thomas Aquinas admitted the possibility of rebellion against tyrants, but only under carefully specified conditions based on the Augustinian theory of a just war, according to which the benefit of the doubt went to the legitimate ruler. Muentzer disconnected the possibility of removing a tyrannical prince from any objective criteria, thereby opening the door for revolution. One commentator claimed Muentzer "transformed what was at first sight a warning against local rebellion into a proclamation of a universal revolution"[73] in his letter to the brothers at Stolberg.

Some claim Muentzer was naïve and unable to see that the principle he articulated would be implemented in ways that contravened his intentions. Others claim he was disingenuous and avid to promote revolution from the beginning. The suspicions are intensified by the way Muentzer ended his letter ("I also hear that when you have been drinking, you talk a lot about our case, but when you are sober, you are as fearful as sissies."[74]), warning the brothers not to talk in their cups, lest they spill the beans about what Muentzer was planning secretly. Baylor claims "it is uncertain whether in 1523 Muentzer was in contact with a secret organization in Stolberg, but there is little doubt that the 'cause' that he warned his associates against discussing when they had been drinking included more than purely personal piety."[75] Muentzer probably felt revolution was appropriate, but before he could proclaim it in public, he needed to create the organization that would bring it about.

In a letter to Luther just four days before Muentzer wrote to the brothers at Stolberg, Muentzer denied any role in the revolution in Zwickau that led to his expulsion. "Everybody," Muentzer wrote to Luther, "except for the

blind city councilors, knows that at the time of the uprising [*tumultus*], I was taking a bath, with no knowledge of such matters. And if I had not intervened against it, the whole council would have been killed the following night."[76] Disavowing responsibility for what happened in Zwickau, Muentzer then discussed the differences between his and Luther's theological views. Muentzer placed heavy emphasis on "the living word of God," Who revealed himself "not only in the Scriptures but also in dreams and visions."[77] Muentzer still hoped for reconciliation with the Master, ending his letter by asking the Lord to "let our old love begin anew," but Luther was disgusted and broke off the relationship with his former student, whom he felt was ensnared by enthusiasm. "I can't stand this spirit, no matter what you want to call it," Luther said about Muentzer, whom he would soon call "the Satan from Allstedt."[78] "He praises my work. . . and yet at the same time holds it in contempt and then goes off looking for greater things . . . so that you have to conclude that he's either drunk or crazy."[79]

In revolutionary terms, the conflict between Luther and Muentzer was the conflict between radicals and moderates. The same conflict had taken place when Zizka turned on the Taborites, and it would take place in every subsequent revolution. Parallels exist in Cromwell's conflict with the Fifth Monarchy Men and in the Menshevik/Bolshevik split. Before long, Muentzer was fighting on two fronts, against both Wittenberg and Rome. Luther was doing the same, siding with the princes against the peasants who threatened not only the social order but also the success of his rebellion against Rome.

Luther soon claimed "the person who has seen Muentzer may claim to have seen the devil incarnate in his very worst raging. Oh, Lord God, whenever such a spirit is abroad among the peasants, it is high time they were destroyed like mad dogs."[80] According to Muentzer, Allstedt was to be run, not by renegade university professors, but by the people themselves, who would create a religious community inspired by the Holy Spirit in dreams and visions. The Elect would rule, and if the princes didn't see it their way, the people would rise up and take the sword from their hands. Anything less was the "contrived faith" of political opportunists, whose chief agent was Luther.

Muentzer's road to revolution began not with a call to arms but rather with the creation of the first German liturgy. Muentzer produced the first comprehensive liturgy in German when Luther was still reluctant to abandon Latin. In seeing the Latin liturgy, like infant baptism, as magic and idolatry, Muentzer was years ahead of Luther in implementing his master's own principles. By summer 1523, "foreigners" from all over southern Thuringia and Saxony were attending Muentzer's German liturgy. This movement of large populations was too dangerous to ignore, so Count Ernst of Mansfeld banned attendance at the liturgies, setting up a conflict between Church and State that would define Muentzer's revolutionary theology. Muentzer then abused the count from the pulpit, inviting him and the local bishop to

Allstedt to "show before the whole world in what way my teaching or service is heretical."[81] If the count did not come, Muentzer would consider him "an evil-doer, a rascal and a knave, a Turk and a pagan."[82] When the people of Allstedt closed ranks behind him, Muentzer was emboldened to articulate his revolutionary theology. At the heart of that theology, which became the heart of his political theory too, was the sword. The sword, claimed Muentzer, must be used in the service of the gospel. If the princes hesitate in following Muentzer's instruction on how to wield the sword, the sword would be taken from them and given to "the people who burn with zeal" and then, alas, "peace will be in abeyance on earth."[83]

"Here," Goertz writes, "the idea of the people's sovereignty surfaces for the first time and combines with mystical piety and apocalyptical expectation to form a threatening prospect for anyone opposed to the Allstedt Reformation."[84] In October 1523, Muentzer wrote to Frederick the Wise, reiterating his position. "Princes," he wrote, "do not frighten the pious. And if it turns out that [the princes do make the pious fear them], then the sword will be taken from them and given to the ardent masses in order to defeat the godless, Daniel 7:18. Then that noble treasure, peace, will be removed from the earth Rev. 6:2."[85] The references to Daniel and Revelation emphasized the apocalyptic nature of Muentzer's thought and increased the likelihood of revolutionary violence. If the world was coming to an end anyway, why refrain? Unlike "the scribes [who] imagine Christ to be the fulfiller of the law, so that they do not have to suffer the action of God by pointing out his cross,"[86] Muentzer was telling his flock, at the end of 1523, that in their suffering, they "should not murmur and growl like whining dogs" because "he who does not die with Christ cannot be resurrected with him."[87] Muentzer cited St. Paul, who "clearly says [Col. 1:24], 'I fulfill that which the suffering of Christ still lacks.' The church suffers as his body."[88] But the suffering was ripped from the tradition of the Gospel and put in the service of revolution, by way of millennialist expectation. The Suffering of the Elect had become the birth pangs of a new revolutionary era.

In 1524, after years of holding his tongue in spite of growing reservations, Erasmus finally broke with the Lutherans when he wrote *De Libero Arbitrio*, his tract on free will. Despite Luther's support of Reuchlin and the humanist cause, Erasmus realized he had a fundamentally different agenda, perhaps furthered by a conspiracy. "After all, Luther is not so far advanced in the knowledge of the tongues or of elegant scholarship to provide supporters of such studies with an interest in his case."[89] Erasmus broke with his Lutheran allies because linking Reuchlin with Luther was "detrimental to the humanist cause." Erasmus needed "to disentangle the two movements." Rummel felt there was

> some evidence for Erasmus' conspiracy theory. Several leading reformers, Melanchthon, Bucer, and Zwingli among them, were all at one stage

> under the impression that Erasmus was one of them and were hoping that he, as the leading humanist, would deliver that party to them. In 1519, for example, Melanchthon spoke of Luther as "our foremost champion, second only to Erasmus"; similarly, Bucer wrote in 1518 that "Luther agrees in everything with Erasmus, the only difference being that what Erasmus merely hints at, Luther teaches openly and freely." Both men revised their opinion in the 1520s. Bucer saw the light in 1524 when Luther and Erasmus engaged in a published controversy over free will.[90]

Luther wrote to Erasmus, begging "If you cannot or dare not be assertive in our cause, leave it alone and keep to your own business."[91] In a letter to Oecolampadius, Luther admitted "I feel Erasmus's barbs occasionally, but since he pretends in public not to be my enemy, I, in turn, pretend that I do not understand his clever words."[92] Hutten pleaded with Erasmus to maintain a united front against the Catholics, at least in public, and "was quite candid about the strategic importance of such a move."[93] In a letter to Erasmus, he noted that some regarded Erasmus as Luther's inspirational source. "You were the forerunner," Hutten wrote, "you taught us. . . . you are the man on whom the rest of us depend."[94] Hutten claimed that the success of the Reformation would guarantee "liberal studies too will flourish and the humanities will be held in honor."[95] But Erasmus not only doubted the intellectual foundations of the Reformation expressed in Luther's notion of the will, he also thought humanistic studies would get dragged into a fight that would harm it more than the scholastic *viri obscuri* could.

Disaffected worshippers continued to pour into Allstedt to take part in Muentzer's revolutionary services, in defiance of Count Ernst's ban. By spring 1524, Muentzer's chapel was full of hundreds of visiting worshippers, mostly peasants from the neighboring countryside and miners from Mansfeld. Muentzer capitalized on the crowds and created his own revolutionary organization. According to testimony gathered after the collapse of the Peasant Revolt, Muentzer assembled 30 followers in a dry moat outside town in March 1524, and initiated them into a secret organization known as the League of the Elect. Using his wife's experience in the convent, Muentzer had her organize and train the town's women, many of whom were runaway nuns. The organization would take up arms in defense of Allstedt, which, like Jerusalem under bar Kokhba and Prague under Huss and (ten years later) Muenster under Bokelzoon, would become the dwelling place of the Elect. All who were unwilling to go along with the Elect were driven from town. Members of the Elect declared their willingness to protect each other against persecutors of the Gospel and swore to back up their oath with force of arms. Martin Luther recognized the gravity of the situation; he immediately urged the princes of Saxony to retaliate, to "break and beat with the fist."[96]

The purpose of the League of the Elect was "brotherly love," but it was a love with revolutionary intent. The Elect swore to refuse to pay tithes to

local convents and monasteries. The Elect believed in fraternity and equality, claiming everything was to be held in common[97] and that each should receive according to his needs.[98] If there were any doubts about their revolutionary nature, the Elect concluded their oath by warning "in all seriousness . . . any princes, dukes or lords" who objected to the program of "*Omnia sunt communia*" that they "would cut off the heads or hang" any rulers who stood in their way.[99] By mid-summer 1524, the League of the Elect had grown to over 500 members, all of whom had sworn their willingness to engage in illegal activity for the sake of the Gospel.

Emboldened by their oath, members of the reformed party in Allstedt increased their attacks on the Church. Resentment focused on a chapel in a wood near town which because of its miraculous image of the Blessed Virgin was a place of pilgrimage. The Mallerbach Chapel belonged to the nuns of Naundorf and was under the custodial care of a hermit who was soon driven off by violence and vandalism. In his confession, Muentzer referred to the chapel as a "*spelunke*" or den. Muentzer incited mob violence by railing against what he considered the idolatrous worship of images there. Muentzer referred to the chapel as a "standing provocation"[100] of the devil that needed to be destroyed by good-hearted, pious people. To buttress his arguments, Muentzer cited the Old Testament, wherein "Pious Moses" in Exodus 23, proclaimed that "you shall not defend the godless."[101] If the civil authorities, Muentzer continued, do not follow this maxim, then they have lost their claim to legitimacy. Because of the violence that often followed Muentzer's sermons, the nuns removed whatever was valuable and placed it under lock and key; by the end of March, when events came to a head, the chapel stood empty and abandoned.

On Holy Thursday, March 24, 1524, a mob of the Elect marched from Allstedt to Mallerbach Chapel and burned it to the ground. Elliger says this was no spur of the moment "act of blind zealotry,"[102] but rather a well planned act of arson and iconoclasm intended, according to Muentzer's plan, to inaugurate the dawn of the Reformation in Allstedt. Muentzer claimed that only this act of symbolic arson could drive the devil's cult from Allstedt.

The Abbess of the convent at Naundorf complained bitterly to Hans Zeiss and the civil authorities, demanding the malefactors be brought to justice. The mayor and city council denied all responsibility and turned the tables on the nuns by claiming they had set the fire to incriminate the citizens of Allstedt. Sensing more than just a simple act of vandalism, Duke John of Saxony demanded a united front among the princes in dealing with Muentzer. Muentzer dealt directly with the issue by writing to Duke John on June 7, 1524, asserting that the League of the Elect was "without guilt" when they burned the chapel to the ground because everyone knew that "poor people"—even though their culpability was lessened "through lack of understanding"—"formerly honored and prayed to the devil at Mallerbach, under the name of Mary."[103] The Duke had no business punishing "good-hearted, pious people"

who had destroyed this haunt of the devil. If Duke John ignored "what G... our creator said through pious Moses"[104] in Exodus 23:1, "You shall not def... the godless," he was no better than the idolatrous monks and nuns. "But ... we should continue to permit the devil at Mallerbach to be prayed to, so ... our brothers are delivered up to him as a sacrifice, this we no more want ... we wish to be subjects of the Turks."[105] The implication was clear. Princes ... permitted idolatry in their realms were no better than Turks and deserved ... be deposed.

On June 11, the local authorities arrested Ziliax Knaut, who was charg... with arson and placed in stocks at the local castle. Muentzer was outraged ... wondered aloud how men who claimed to be pious Christian princes coul... defend monks and nuns, people "the whole world" agreed were "idolatro... people."[106] Not content to sermonize, Muentzer sounded the alarm on June 13 when the prince's men came to Allstedt to arrest Knaut's co-conspirator... The League of the Elect assembled immediately and, after showing their willingness to use force of arms, forced the prince's men to withdraw. Instead of apprehending the other arsonists, the administrator returned to Weima... and filed a report.

Luther's letter to the princes of Saxony concerning the revolutionary spirit in Saxony was published in August 1524, but it was written with the destruction of the Mallerbach Chapel in mind. Luther was in danger of losing control of his revolution to the more radical followers of Muentzer, who was willing to plunge Germany into anarchy in pursuit of his fantastic notion of the gospel. Muentzer, in Luther's view, was "full of babble about the holy spirit and revelations in visions, but incapable of producing miracles to prove himself. Above all his preaching bore no other fruit than that of inciting the rabble to violence."[107] If the reformers preached insurrection, "secular rulers had the right and duty to meet force with force."[108] To stop the "Satan of Allstedt," Luther drew a clear line between spiritual reform and political revolution by denouncing Muentzer as a Judaizer. Abandoning the philo-Semitism he adopted in the Reuchlin/Pfefferkorn controversy, Luther claimed those who strike with their fists are behaving like Jews. Luther fought fire with fire by quoting from Daniel and Isaiah of the Old Testament to bolster his case. "Preaching and suffering are our vocation," Luther writes, "not striking out with the fist and battling in self defense. After all, neither Christ nor his apostles broke into churches and destroyed images; rather they won over hearts by appealing to God's word, and after that churches [i.e., temples] and graven images fell of their own accord. We should do likewise."[109]

Although the Jews of Moses' time were commanded to destroy the altars and idols of the Canaanites, Luther continues, that doesn't mean the Reformed have received the same command. Nor would the Reformed be justified in sacrificing their children, as Abraham was commanded to do. If Christians are bound by Muentzer's cock-eyed interpretation of the Old

Testament, then "we would all have to be circumcised and do the works of the Jews,"[110] i.e, follow the old law in its entirety. The logical conclusion of Muentzer's revolutionary theology is that Christians should behave like Jews. "If it is right for Christians to break into churches and engage in acts of iconoclasm," Luther reasoned, "then it follows that we should also murder anyone who isn't a Christian, just as the Jews were ordered to exterminate the Canaanites and the Amorites. The spirit of Allstedt will bring about nothing but bloodshed, and anyone who disagrees with their heavenly voices will end up being strangled by them."[111]

Muentzer responded in his "Highly Provoked Defense" in late summer 1524, calling Luther Doctor Luegner (Liar) and accusing him of misrepresentation. According to Muentzer, Luther is like Jews who "continually wanted to slander and discredit Christ, just as Luther now does me."[112] Muentzer protests that when Luther says "that I want to make a rebellion" Luther twists the sense of Muentzer's letter to the Mansfeld miners. But, Muentzer concedes Luther's point: "I proclaimed before the princes that the entire community had the power of the sword, just as it had the keys of remitting sin."[113] As a result, "The lords themselves are responsible for making the poor people their enemy. They do not want to remove the cause of insurrection, so how, in the long run, can things improve? I say this openly, so Luther asserts I must be rebellious. So be it."[114]

Muentzer then uses *ad hominem* arguments against Luther, bringing up Luther's notorious reputation as a drunk, glutton, and whoremonger, the very allegations that led him to marry the nun, Catherina von Bora. Luther, according to Muentzer, is "totally incapable of shame, like the Jews who brought to Christ the woman taken in adultery."[115] Muentzer finds it astonishing "this shameless monk can claim to be terribly persecuted, there [at Wittenberg] with this good Malvasian wine and his whore's banquets."[116] Luther uses his "new logic" of faith alone, which he "deceptively called the word of God"[117] to distract the faithful from his loose living and sinfulness.

Muentzer perceived what might be the personal issues at the heart of Luther's doctrine of the enslaved will. It was easy to extrapolate from Luther's behavior to a theological "principle," which wanted "to make God responsible for the fact that you are a poor sinner and a venomous little worm with your shitty humility. You have done this with your fantastic reasoning, which you have concocted out of your Augustine. It is truly a blasphemy to despise mankind impudently, which you do in your teaching concerning the freedom of the will."[118] Luther's false faith had political consequences; Luther was forced to "flatter the princes," and offer them "Bohemian gifts" of "cloisters and foundations, which you now promise the princes" in exchange for protection.[119] Muentzer has little good to say about Luther's appearance before the Imperial Diet at Worms, because "If you had wavered at Worms, you would have been stabbed by the nobility rather than set free."[120] Luther

and his followers "preach what suits them, but what they really pursue is the belly. . . . The sole and only outcome of their teachings is the freedom of the flesh. Hence they poison the Bible for the Holy Spirit."[121]

Muentzer then claims Luther's views on insurrection are merely an attempt to curry favor with the princes by one who is morally compromised and without clear judgment.[122] Luther "wants to be a new Christ who had gained much good for Christendom with his blood. And what is more, he did this for the sake of a fine thing—that priests might take wives."[123] Muentzer, though, was also compromised on celibacy, having bound himself by two contradictory vows. The same sexual stimulus, however, drove the two reformers in opposite directions. It drove Luther to curry favor with princes, but it drove Muentzer to rebel against them.

In July 1524 Duke John and his nephew the elector prince John Frederick arrived in Allstedt without having read Luther's analysis of the revolutionary spirit there. Their arrival may have been a routine visit to a city of their realm, but it was more likely an attempt to find out what Muentzer was up to. On July 13, the princes attended Muentzer's modified Mass at the castle chapel, during which Muentzer gave a detailed explanation of his theology of revolution. For his text, Muentzer chose the story of Nebuchadnezzar's dream in Daniel 2, the *locus classicus* for millennialism. The sermon is known as *Die Fuerstenpredigt*, or sermon to the princes.

Daniel 2 begins with King Nebuchadnezzar's dream. When Nebuchadnezzar's seers prove incapable of interpreting it, Daniel interprets it correctly. The orthodox interpretation of the dream, as we have seen, is that the stone, untouched by any hand, which destroyed the statue, is Christ, and that the fifth kingdom is the reign of Christ on earth, the Roman Catholic Church, the New Jerusalem, the City of God, the kingdom which will have no end. Muentzer modifies the traditional orthodox interpretation of Daniel 2 to suit himself. The fifth empire is, according to Muentzer, not the kingdom which will have no end, but rather "the one which we have before our own eyes," i.e., the Holy Roman Empire, which "would like to be coercive. But as we see before our very eyes, the iron is intermixed with filth, vain schemes of flattery that slither and squirm over the face of the whole earth. For he who cannot be a cheat [in our empire] must be an idiot."[124]

The stone that shattered the colossus is "The poor laity and the peasants" who see that they are now shattering the Roman Church "much more clearly than you do."[125] To help the princes understand the signs of the times, "a new Daniel must arise and interpret your revelation for you. And this same new Daniel must go forth, as Moses teaches, Deut 20:2, at the head of the troops. He must reconcile the anger of the prices and that of the enraged people. . . . For Christ says, in Matthew 10:34, 'I have not come to bring peace but the sword.'"[126]

Before long it must have become obvious to the princes listening to his sermon that the "new Daniel" was Muentzer. Unlike Luther and the scriptural literalists from Wittenberg—men Muentzer compares to Nebuchadnezzar's impotent seers—Muentzer has visions. Like Daniel, Muentzer could claim "the mystery was revealed to [him] in a night vision" (Dan. 2:19). True spiritual leaders have visions. Luther, who is neither conscious of nor receptive to this inner word, does "not know how to say anything essential about God, even though he may have devoured a hundred thousand Bibles."[127]

Before long, Muentzer uses visions as the validator of truth. Visions became Muentzer's substitute for the Church as the final arbiter of doctrine, just as the Bible became the arbiter for Luther. Muentzer even appropriated words traditionally associated with the Church in professions of faith like the Apostles Creed and applied them to visions, preaching "it is a truly apostolic, patriarchal and prophetic spirit that awaits visions and attains them in painful tribulation."[128]

Luther, whom Muentzer describes as "Brother Fatted Swine" and "Brother Soft Life,"[129] is a false prophet because he rejects the crucial role of visions. It would be impossible to safeguard the new Christianity "securely against error on all sides and to act blamelessly, if [the leaders of the new Church] did not rely on revelations from God—As Aaron heard from Moses, Exodus 4:15 and David from Nathan and Gad 2 Chron 29:25."[130]

Just as Nebuchadnezzar elevated Daniel, so the German princes should elevate Muentzer over Luther. "You rulers," Muentzer told the princes, "must act according to the conclusion of this chapter of Daniel [Dan 2:48]. That is why Nebuchanezzar elevated holy Daniel to office so that the king might carry out God's correct decision, inspired by the Holy Spirit. . . . For the godless have no right to life except that which the elect decide to grant them, as is written in the book of Exodus 23:29-33. . . . He to whom is given all power in heaven and on earth [Christ] wants to lead the government."[131] The princes should do this because Luther is an uninspired court prophet, whereas Muentzer is the reincarnation of Daniel.

By the time Muentzer gave his sermon to the princes, he had converted to what Cohn calls "bloodthirsty chiliasm."[132] Cohn attributes this conversion to the ideas of Nicholas Storch, who kept alive Taborite ideas spread by the Hussite armies one hundred years earlier. Once Muentzer turned from Luther's version of the reformed faith, he became, as Luther predicted, an ardent Judaizer. Muentzer "now thought and talked only of the Book of Revelation and of such incidents in the Old Testament as Elijah's slaughter of the priests of Baal, Jehu's slaying of the sons of Ahab, and Jael's assassination of the sleeping Sisera."[133] He got these ideas from Storch, who had been in Bohemia, and revived the Taborite teachings when he returned to Zwickau. Muentzer needed Storch's Hussite judaizing to justify his path of revolution because political revolution and its justification by a heretical reading of Old

Testament were two sides of the same coin. Neither could exist without the other; both were a function of the rejection of the Cross among clergy during the 16th century. "The elect," wrote Cohn summarizing the political doctrine of all revolutionary Judaizers, "must prepare the way for the Millennium . . . by force of arms."[134]

In his sermon, Muentzer told the princes they must wield the sword in service of the Gospel. Muentzer refused to listen to "hackneyed posturing about the power of God achieving everything without resort to your sword." If the princes failed to use the sword as Muentzer saw fit, "it may rust in its scabbard."[136] God fought on the side of the Israelites when they conquered the Promised Land, "but the sword was the means used, just as eating and drinking is a means for us to stay alive. Hence the sword too is necessary for us to eliminate the godless."[137] Since Christ warned those who lived by the sword would die by it, Muentzer gravitated toward Old Testament passages to justify his theology of revolution, citing Deut. 13:6, "do not permit false prophets, who turn us away from God, to live longer," as well as Exodus 22:1 where God says, "You shall not permit the evildoer to live."[138] The Old Testament was ransacked to justify iconoclasm as well, for it was God Himself who "commanded through Moses in Deut 7:5 . . . 'You shall not have pity on the idolatrous. Break up their altars. Smash their images and burn them so that I am not angry with you.'"[139] "Christ," Muentzer claimed, ignoring what Jesus said to Peter in the Garden of Gethsemane, "has not abrogated these words. Rather, he will help us to fulfill them."[140] According to Muentzer, anyone who claims the antichrist will be destroyed without a sword-bearing hand being lifted

> is already as fainthearted as the Canaanites were when the elect wanted to enter the promised land, as Joshua [5:1] writes. Joshua, nevertheless did not spare them from the sharpness of the sword. Look at Psalm 44:4 and I Chronicles 14:11. There you will find the same solution: the elect did not win the promised land with the sword alone, but rather through the power of God. Nevertheless, the sword was the means, just as for us eating and drinking are the means for sustaining life. Thus the sword is also necessary as a means to destroy the godless, Romans 13 [1-4].[141]

Here, Muentzer touches on the same passage (Romans 13) that Luther used to proscribe all rebellion against princely authority, no matter how onerous or unjust. *Sola scriptura* obviously was not going to lead to unity of purpose even among committed reformers. Once an impasse was reached, naked physical power, not textual exegesis, would determine whose interpretation was correct. Muentzer and Luther were avid during the crucial summer of 1524 to get the princes on their respective sides. If Luther chose the carrot of "Bohemian gifts," i.e., bribing the princes with confiscated church property, Muentzer chose the stick of insurrection. If the princes will not wield the sword in the

service of the Gospel, "then the sword will be taken away from them, Daniel 7:27."[143] Muentzer, "together with pious Daniel," urged the princes "not to oppose God's revelation." If they refused to heed Muentzer's advice, then "may they be strangled without any mercy"[145] "as Hezekiah (2 Kings 18-22), Josiah, Cyrus, Daniel and Elijah (1 Kings 18) destroyed the priests of Baal."[144] There was no possibility of reform unless the Church "return[ed] to its source,"[145] namely, Muentzer's apocalyptic Old Testament fantasy of heaven on earth. The time of the harvest was upon them, and "the tares must be pulled out of Gods' vineyard at the time of harvest."[146] Since he had "the instruction of the whole of divine law" on his side, Muentzer could say without hesitation that all "godless rulers, especially the priests and monks, should be killed."[147]

Before long it became clear that wielding the sword meant joining the revolution. If the princes didn't join the revolution, they would be swept away by it. Muentzer made Reformation and Revolution synonymous, but many of the reformers wanted no part of what he was proposing. Luther would soon send his letter to the Saxon princes condemning the revolutionary spirit. Karlstadt and the congregation at Orlamuenda followed Luther's lead, informing Muentzer they had no interest in armed insurrection. "We have not been commanded to act in this manner, for Christ told Peter to put down his sword. . . . If the time comes when we have to suffer for God's justice, let us be willing to do so, but in the meantime let's not run to take up knives and pikes."[148]

Unsurprisingly, Muentzer's sermon left the princes unpersuaded. Surprisingly, they didn't have Muentzer arrested for treason on the spot. If Muentzer's goal was to convey as unambiguously as possible his newly concocted theology of revolution, then he succeeded. The princes left in silence, probably disposed to think of Muentzer as Luther described him, as a "*Schwaermer*" or dangerous religious enthusiast. Hans Zeiss, the princes' administrator, was told not to allow "the preacher" to engage in fomenting public disorders or creating "special alliances." But the town was filling with refugees, many of whom were renegade monks and nuns eager to put Muentzer's revolutionary theories into practice, a situation the princes could not ignore much longer.

Carried away by his own enthusiasm, Muentzer began writing letters informing his followers that the end times had commenced. "The Play is about to begin,"[149] Muentzer wrote "To the God-fearing at Sangerhausen" just two days after he had harangued the princes. In his letter, Muentzer indicated that the League in Allstedt was only one part of a network of "more than 30" revolutionary organizations God was using against tyrants "to tear them out by the roots" just as "Joshua 11:20 has prophesied this for us."[150] One week later he wrote to Zeiss explaining that because the princes "were violating not only the faith but also these people's natural rights, they should be strangled like dogs."[151] Muentzer also told Zeiss "the terrible phenomenon of civil war"

would soon "be unleashed" and he "must no longer hold to the custom ... obeying other officials" than Muentzer because the princes had discredited themselves in Gods' eyes: "Their power has an end, and it will soon be handed over to the common people. So act carefully."[152]

Muentzer also told Zeiss to resist with force anyone who came to Allstedt to apprehend "those responsible for Mallerbach." If the authorities attempted arrests, "they should be strangled like mad dogs." He advised Zeiss "the civil guidelines no longer function at all, for they are vain mire."[153] As a result, Muentzer made up his own rules, as when "I gave my honest advice about how Christendom should conduct itself as I expounded. . . about Holy Josiah, where the priest Hilkias found the book of the law, which he sent to the elders in Judah and Jerusalem. And he went with all the people into the temple and made covenant with God, to which the whole community agreed, so that each of the elect was able to preserve and study the witness of God with his whole soul and heart [2 Kings 22-23]."[154]

The new rules thus demanded a new social order, according to which the Elect would rule themselves without prince or priest lording it over them. Instead of the medieval society of social classes, Muentzer proposed "a modern league or covenant [which] should be made in such a form that the common man unites with pious officials for the sake of the gospel alone."[155] In a curious aside to a letter written on the first anniversary of his marriage to the runaway nun Ottilie von Gerson, Muentzer admonished Zeiss "if he is inclined to unchastity, that he hurts his lust the very first time he sins by making a determined effort to observe both his lust and the thorns of this conscience. If he keeps his conscience active, then the filth of unchastity consumes itself in horror."[156]

Muentzer seemingly kept the filth of unchastity at bay by throwing himself into revolutionary activity. On July 24, after preaching again on the covenant King Josiah and the Elders of Israel made with God, Muentzer called for a similar covenant among the Elect of Allstedt urging them to band together for mutual protection against tyrants. By that afternoon, the Elect of Allstedt, including women and girls trained by Muentzer's wife, were armed and ready to resist efforts to subdue the new revolutionary covenant, which had chosen the rainbow for its flag, a symbol from the Old Testament based on God's covenant with Noah after the flood.

When Duke John heard of Muentzer's sermon and the revolutionary organization he had formed, he summoned Muentzer to Weimar. After two days of interrogation, the duke's officials informed Muentzer the League of the Elect must be dissolved and those responsible for the arson at the Mallerbach Chapel must be arrested and brought to trial. Muentzer must also shut down his newly purchased printing press, which would prevent him from responding to Luther's attack.

By June 18, 1524, Luther was referring to Muentzer as the "Satan of Allstedt" in a letter to the Elector. Muentzer was nonetheless surprised by the vehemence of Luther's attack on the revolutionary spirit in Allstedt. If he gave up his printing press, he was unable to rebut. On August 3, Muentzer complained bitterly to Friedrich the Wise that Luther's letter contained "not a hint of brotherly exhortation in it; he just barges his way in like some pompous tyrant, full of ferocity and hate."[157] Muentzer knew "the Christian faith which I preach is not in accord with that of Luther."[158] This, of course, came as no surprise to Luther or the princes. Luther urged the princes to put an end to Muentzer's seditious ravings and prevent the impending revolution. "It is obvious," Luther wrote later, Muentzer was "totally rebellious. If it had lasted longer and come to the point, he would have set the people on the authorities, and it would have gone hard with them. Then, so I am reliably informed, he has written a ferocious letter to the Mansfeld miners and encouraged them to be bold; he intends them to wash their hands in the blood of tyrants. The common people have been thoroughly poisoned by his teachings."[159]

Muentzer's alliance dissolved without contest, and the printing press shut down. Many people distanced themselves from their preacher. As a result, Muentzer did what he had become accustomed to doing for his entire adult ministry. During the night of August 7-8, 1524, Muentzer slipped "over the town's wall secretly,"[160] and, abandoning his wife and child, ran off with a goldsmith from Nordhausen. In an unsent open letter to the Allstedters, probably written more for his own benefit than theirs, Muentzer justified his flight by declaring "you would have abandoned me to the Cross."[161].

A week later, Muentzer arrived in Muehlhausen, his next base of operations. There, Muentzer met the runaway monk Heinrich Pfeiffer, who had been stirring up the town since his arrival with a group of his equally violent brethren in late 1522. He and his fellow runaways preached, without permission, in the homes of workers and artisans or in the public square. The court in Erfurt demanded that the city authorities end the practice, but the city council had difficulty executing the order because the monks had rallied many people to the reformed cause when they got them to vow to defend the vagabond preachers in the Church of St. Mary.

Muehlhausen was one of the largest cities in middle Germany, but it was on a downward economic slide when Muentzer arrived. The economic downturn meant the city was ripe for revolt. Riches, combined with a greedy oligarchy that controlled the city council, had created a great disparity in the distribution of wealth as well as widespread poverty. The city councilmen tried to deflect attention from their own greed by focusing unrest, with the help of Pfeiffer and other runaway monks, on the three monasteries in town. As became typical in Germany, the drunken dissolute renegade monks excoriated the monks who remained faithful to their vows for their dissolute

lives and blamed the lot of the poor not on the policies of the oligarchy that ran the city council but on the exemption of the clergy from paying taxes.

When the city council tried to restrain the runaway monks in July 1524, Pfeiffer's supporters rose in armed revolt, plundered the local monasteries, divided up the spoils among themselves, and forced the council to accede to their demands. By August, the council had regained control and expelled Pfeiffer from town, but agents continued to agitate behind the scenes, and Pfeiffer returned in December after Duke John of Weimar, who would soon mull over Muentzer's fate, interceded. Pfeiffer took up his preaching post at the Church of St. Nicholas, and social unrest followed in the wake of his sermons. Pfeiffer's female followers, mostly runaway nuns, drove the priest from the Church of St. Blaise after threatening him with drawn knives. The priest at St. Kilian's Church had the chalice ripped from his hands during Mass, whereupon Pfeiffer's followers, demonstrating their connection to the Hussites, distributed communion under both species.

In June 1524, Pfeiffer's followers broke into a church run by Dominicans and engaged in iconoclasm. Two months later, Muentzer wrote to the city council of Nordhausen, justifying iconoclasm by appealing to the Old Testament. Those who promote the veneration of images, Muentzer wrote, "should be stoned" to death "according to the punishment of Mosaic Law."[162] Those who used images to aid their devotion, "be it a cross or a circle," are guilty of "the greatest blasphemy against God." This blasphemy is like "the adultery and whoredom about which Hosea writes [Hos 4:2 and 4:10]. Just as one commits adultery outwardly against the spouse, using the sexual organs of the flesh so adultery also occurs inwardly in the spirit if a man delights in images or created things in order to mock him who is unlike all images or creatures."[163] The mob of apostate monks wrecking churches throughout Thuringia and Saxony should not be punished because "he who smashes an idol that blasphemes God does no injustice, for his zeal is the zeal of the Lord and his action praises God."[164] Muentzer concludes his letter "In God's name release the prisoners."[165]

On August 21, Luther wrote to the city council at Muehlhausen warning of "the false prophet and wolf in sheep's clothing" heading their way and urging them not to allow Muentzer into their town, describing Muentzer as a tree "which bore no other fruit than murder, insurrection and bloodshed,"[166] but the council was powerless to resist the monks and their followers. Muentzer arrived in Muehlhausen about the time he wrote his own letter justifying iconoclasm to the city council at Nordhausen. So, unsurprisingly, the apostate monks and their followers welcomed him with open arms.

Muentzer lost no time mobilizing Pfeiffer's followers by founding a chapter of the League of the Elect. Renaming his revolutionary organization Eternal Alliance, Muentzer incorporated the renegade monks and their followers under the image of the rainbow, which he affixed to a white flag along with

the motto: "This is the sign of God's eternal covenant, and all who intend to support the Alliance should march under it."[167] The insistence on acceptance of suffering as the surest way to implement God's will faded from Muentzer's sermons and was replaced by Old Testament proof texts that justified taking up the sword, along with the promise that "the people will go free and God alone will be their Lord."[168]

Muentzer's opportunity to take up the sword came soon enough, when a furrier who was a follower of the renegade monks got drunk at a wedding reception and insulted two city council members. When the councilmen tried to arrest him, they set off an insurrection. Muentzer and Pfeiffer, wielding a naked sword and a red cross, led 200 followers out of town in protest. The sword symbolically pointed toward sedition and insurrection. By bearing the naked sword before him in procession Muentzer indicated he was *de facto* the legal authority in Muehlhausen and that he and his followers were willing to use military force. "The bearing of the sword has its significance," St. Paul said in his epistle to the Romans (13:4). Recognizing that significance, the city council released the furrier and then fled because they feared the Eternal Alliance would murder them in their beds. By September 27, the city council had regained the upper hand and, as their first act, they expelled Muentzer and Pfeiffer. Both men fled to Bibra, where they met with the bookseller Hans Hut, later founder of the Hutterites, and included him as a member of the Eternal Alliance, which was gaining momentum among the lower classes in Saxony and Thuringia. Hutt introduced them to other revolutionary groups and arranged publication of Muentzer's tract "Special Exposure."

Muentzer then traveled incognito to Basel, where he met Johannes Oecolampadius and Ulrich Hugwald, who encouraged him to visit the Hegau and Klettgau regions, where the looting of Church property was coalescing into the Peasant Revolt. Oecolampadius and Hugwald were followers of the Swiss reformer, Huldreich Zwingli. Muentzer did not meet Zwingli in Basel, probably because Zwingli was having troubles of his own. Catholics were attacking Zwingli as a Judaizer, as Luther had attacked Muentzer. "[S]o strong was the suspicion of his Jewish affiliations" that he responded in print, denying "he had derived his knowledge of Scriptures from a certain Jew of Winterthur, named Moses."[169] Zwingli was charged with secret association with the Jews, but his pamphlet denied what "certain monks are saying," namely, that "we have learned at Zurich all our knowledge of the Divine Word from the Jews."[170] Being stigmatized as a Half-Jew or a Judaizer acting as an agent of the Jews would have cost Zwingli his credibility as a reformer. So he denied "what has been said," namely, "that the Jew, Moses of Winterthur, has openly boasted that he comes to us and teaches us, and that we have repeatedly gone to him in secret and that I have received him through a third person."[171] Zwingli, however, admits "It is true that a short time ago in the presence of more than ten learned and pious men of Zurich, I had conversed with him concerning

certain prophecies in the Old Testament; but all concerning their error, that they are in misery, since they refuse to accept the Lord Jesus Christ."[173]

Newman indicates there was good reason that "several of Zwingli's doctrines were called 'Judaic.'"[173] Like Muentzer, Zwingli felt "the history of Israel constituted the normal standard of Christian life; he also felt that the writings of Moses were the most ancient revelation and hence the highest authority."[174] Zwingli's "reliance on the Old Testament" had political consequences, just as they had had for Muentzer, because "Zwingli's model commonwealth had its roots in the Mosaic theocracy."[175] And in practicing "Old Testament theocratic and anti-monarchical principles, Zwingli," like Cromwell and Muentzer, "appealed to the examples of Joshua and Gideon, as he went forth to battle in both the first and second Cappel wars."[176] Zwingli, according to Newman, admitted he learned Hebrew from a Jew, Andrew Boeschenstein, and that he had debated "the messianic prophecies" with Moses of Winterthur. The Catholics, according to Newman, correctly asserted Zwingli "not only inclined towards the Jewish Old Testament, but also had direct relations with local Jews."[177] The issue died when Zwingli died on the battlefield of Cappel, but the suspicion that the Protestants were demi-Jews collaborating with the Jews in their destruction of the Catholic Church never went away because there was too much evidence—iconoclasm, devotion to Hebrew scriptures, Old Testament prooftexting, and Unitarian attacks on the Trinity—to support it.

By Easter 1525 the Peasant Revolt was no longer a threat; it was a reality. The sporadic looting of Church property had become a concerted effort to topple princes from their thrones and put the sword-bearing, Bible-citing masses in their place. The peasant uprising began on the Upper Rhine and spread like a fire driven by a strong wind. One by one the castles and monasteries in the path of the marauding peasant horde went up in flames after their stores were looted to swell the revolutionaries' coffers.

Luther visited the war theater and witnessed the anarchy first hand. We can imagine him railing at the peasants he had indirectly inspired, and them laughing at his words as they marched off to plunder another monastery. If Luther had any qualms, they were repressed when he wrote his tract urging the princes to slaughter the murderous thieving peasant hordes. The man who strangles the revolutionary is doing a good deed in God's eyes:

> Because when it comes to revolutionaries, every man is both judge and executioner, just as when a fire breaks out, the first man to get there and put it out is the best man for the job. I say this because revolution is not an evil like murder, rather it is like a raging conflagration, something that burns an entire country to the ground and lays everything to waste in its path. Revolution brings in its wake a land full of murder and bloodshed, and it makes widows and orphans and destroys everything in its path like the worst evil imaginable. As a result everyone who is able should go on

> the attack and strangle and stab, either openly or clandestinely, with just one consideration in mind, namely, that there is nothing more poisonous, pathological or diabolical than a revolutionary. It's the same as when you have to slaughter a mad dog. If you don't kill him, he will kill you and, on top of that, will take your entire country with you when you go.[178]

Many princes were intimidated by the mob and by the fact that the old order seemed fated to change. Frederick the Wise witnessed the devastation from his deathbed and was overcome by an eerie lassitude. "May God turn his wrath from us," he prayed. But then, as if resigned to the inevitable, added, "if God wills it, it will turn out that the common man will rule."[179] Many nobles went over to the revolutionaries to preserve what they had and to augment it in the sacking of monasteries. The Count of Stolberg, birthplace of Muentzer, submitted to the rebels without a fight. The Counts of Schwarzburg and Hohnstein did the same, relinquishing their aristocratic titles and becoming "brother" revolutionaries, much as the Duc d'Orleans would do two and half centuries later when he became known as Philippe Égalité. Their castles were handed over to the peasants, who graciously compensated them by giving them confiscated church property in exchange.

Thomas Muentzer expressed his euphoria in the many letters he wrote urging his followers to join in the upheaval. "The whole of Germany, France, Italy is awake," Muentzer wrote to his former congregation in Allstedt. "The master wants to set the game in motion; the evil-doers are for it. At Fulda, four abbeys were laid waste during Easter Week, the peasants in the Klettgau and the Hegau in the Black Forest have risen, three thousand strong, and the size of the peasant host is growing all the time."[180] Muentzer admonished the Allstedters to fight the Lord's battle by joining with the miners from Mansfeld and the peasants in neighboring towns and villages. "Go to it," he continued. "Go to it while the fire is hot! Don't let your sword grow cold, don't let it hang down limply! Hammer away ding-dong on the anvils of Nimrod, cast down their tower to the ground."[181] Muentzer regarded Nimrod, according to one commentator, "not only as the first builder of cities but as the originator of private property and class distinctions."[182]

When he addressed the League at Allstedt in April 1525, Muentzer, as a Catholic priest, knew that he had to go against the Catholic grain by reminding his flock "do not be merciful."[183] The only way he could make this anti-Christian injunction plausible was by invoking the Old Testament:

> Do not be merciful, even though Esau offers you good words, Genesis 33:4. Pay no heed to the lamentations of the godless. They will bid you in a friendly manner [for mercy], cry and plead like children. Do no let yourselves be merciful, as God commanded through Moses, Deuteronomy 7: 1-5. And God has revealed the same thing to us. Stir up the villages and cities, and especially the miners with other good fellows

> who would be good for our cause. We must sleep no longer. . . . The peasants of Eisfeld have taken up arms against their lords, and shortly, they will show them no mercy. May events of this kind be an example for you. You must go at them, at them. The time is here. . . . Pass this letter on to the miners. . . . At them, at them while the fire is hot! Do not let your sword get cold, do not let your arms go lame! Strike—cling, clang!—on the anvils of Nimrod. Throw their towers to the ground. . . . God leads you—follow, follow! The story is already written—Matthew 24, Ezekiel 34, Daniel 74, Ezra 16, Revelation 6—scriptural passages that are all interpreted by Romans 13. . . . When Jehosaphat heard these words he fell down. Do likewise.[184]

Ernst Bloch, the 20th century Marxist, described Muentzer's exhortation as "the most impassioned, frenzied manifesto of revolution of all time."[185] The question is whether Muentzer was swept away by excitement of the moment or whether he had abandoned the principles of mystical suffering earlier. Manfred Bensing says Muentzer became a revolutionary when the peasants revolted; others claim he had been a revolutionary all along. Either way, Muentzer felt the revolutionary activity around him vindicated his theological views.

In February 1525, Muentzer surfaced in Fulda during revolutionary disturbances in that city. Soon, he was back in Muehlhausen, where he was welcomed with open arms. On March 17, Muentzer and Pfeiffer organized a coup that deposed the city council and put the Eternal Council, made up of the Elect, in its place. Marching under Muentzer's rainbow banner, the Eternal Council prepared to bring on the advent of the Millennium by force of arms. Eerie parallels with the Taborites continued to emerge. Like Jan Zelivsky, another master at political mobilization of the mob, Muentzer harangued the alliance members assembled outside city walls to engage in military exercises, until a captain cut him off and told him preachers belonged in the pulpit. Like Jan Zelivsky, Muentzer fancied himself a military leader, an illusion that would have devastating consequences for the German peasants, just as it had had for the Hussites under Zelivsky. The crowd for their part discharged the energy which Muentzer had infused into them by sacking the convent of St. Mary Magdalene when they returned to town. Once the Eternal Council took over governance of Muehlhausen, Muentzer seemed ready to spread the gospel of revolution to the rest of Germany.

When word reached the Elect in Muehlhausen that the administrator in Salza had arrested evangelical preachers and planned to execute them, Muentzer decided to act. On April 26, Muentzer marched out of town under the rainbow banner with several hundred men to liberate the preachers, punish the council that had imprisoned them, and drive the Franciscans from the monasteries. Muentzer's exalted state of mind can be inferred from letters he wrote while his army was on the march and the end of the world seemed imminent. "God," Muentzer wrote to the people of Eisenach, "is now moving

nearly the whole world to a recognition of divine truth, and this recognition is also proved with the greatest zeal against the tyrants as Daniel 7:27 clearly says. There Daniel prophesied that power shall be given to the common people, which is also indicated in Revelation 11:15—that Christ shall have jurisdiction over the kingdom of this world."[186] The Lord was using the weak, i.e., Muentzer and his ragtag army of peasants, "to knock the mighty from their thrones," as he had used "unlearned people in order to bring about the ruination of the untrue, treacherous scribes."[187]

In a letter of May 12, Muentzer addressed Count Ernst of Mansfeld as, "You miserable, needy bag of maggots," asking him "who made you a prince of people whom God has won with his precious blood?" Then Muentzer informed the count that he would be "persecuted and annihilated" by Muentzer's avenging army of saints. To make this sedition more palatable, Muentzer cast it in the familiar terms of Old Testament drama. "God," Muentzer informed Count Ernst, "has hardened you like King Pharaoh and like the kings that God wanted to wipe out, Joshua 5 and 11. . . . In brief, through God's mighty power, you have been delivered up for destruction. If you do not want to humble yourself before the little people, then an eternal shame before all Christendom will fall on your neck and you will become a martyr for the devil. . . . So that you also know that we have a strict order about it, I say: The eternal living God has ordered us to push you from your throne with the power that has been given us." The entire Old Testament—here Muentzer listed "Ezekiel 34:1 and 39:1, Daniel 7:11, Micha 3:1-4," as well as "Obadiah the prophet says [Ob 4]"—was unanimous "that your lair must be torn apart and smashed to pieces."[188]

On the same day, Muentzer wrote to Count Albrecht of Mansfeld with the same message, enlivened by invidious references to Muentzer's archrival Luther: "Have you not been able to find in your Lutheran grits and your Wittenberg soup what Ezekiel 37:26-7 prophesies? And have you not been able to taste in your Martinian manure what the same prophet says later, Ezekiel 30:17-20"? Muentzer's message was simple. According to his reading of Daniel 7, "God has given power to the community." One day later, Muentzer said the same to the people of Erfurt. "Daniel 7:27" or at least Muentzer's reading of it, specified "power shall be given to the common people." People must be free of tyrants "if the pure word of God is to dawn." The people of Erfurt, therefore, should "Help us in every way that you can, with manpower and artillery, so that we fulfill what God himself has commanded, Ezekiel 34:25, where he says, 'I will release you from those who have beaten you with their tyranny. I will drive the wild animals from your land.'"[189]

Muentzer arrived in Frankenhausen on May 12, and was immediately accepted by the rebel hordes as their leader; he then acted as judge in a capital case, condemning three men to death and presiding over their execution. He also began signing his letters, "Thomas Muentzer with the sword of Gideon."[190]

This form of signature indicated more than just turning from the Cross and taking up the sword in Old Testament judaizing fashion. It also indicated that Muentzer was increasingly preoccupied with military matters. The size of his army may have prompted him to associate his fate with Gideon's: Muentzer arrived at Frankenhausen at the head of only 300 men and eight mounted guns because of a split over strategy with Heinrich Pfeiffer. Muentzer wanted to attack Ernst von Mansfeld's army with the help of the peasant host already near Frankenhausen. Pfeiffer was less daring than Muentzer, opting for a more defensive strategy. Pfeiffer wanted to take advantage of the rich spoils near Eichsfeld. Three hundred years later, Friedrich Engels claimed Pfeiffer represented "the local narrow-minded class view of the petty bourgeois"[191] that betrayed the real revolution represented by Muentzer and his peasant army.

Pfeiffer had reason to be defensive. Pfeiffer knew their campaign was not going to consist of a series of easy looting sessions now that the princes had mobilized for war. By 1525, the princes saw the peasants as a serious threat. Instead of perceived orderly exploitation from Rome, they were confronted with anarchy from below. The time had come to end that threat and, with Luther's blessing, consolidate power in their own hands to the detriment of the peasants and the Roman Church. The year 1525 saw a rising crescendo of battles, at the end of which 100,000 peasants would be dead. Around the same time that Muentzer arrived in Frankenhausen, Luther's ally, Philip of Hesse, had just crushed the peasants at Fulda and advanced toward Frankenhausen, arriving on May 14 after an all night march. Fatigue may have contributed to his defeat in the first skirmish with the rebels, who numbered about 6,000. The peasants won the first battle, even though they were numerically far inferior to Philips' force. Philip, however, had time on his side; Saxon reinforcements were on their way from Leipzig. The peasants were unaware of all this; as a result, morale rose in the peasant camp. Gideon might win this one after all.

When the sun rose on May 15, the situation did not look good for the rebels. The Saxon troops had arrived, bolstering Philip of Hesse's army. The miners from Mansfeld who were supposed to join the rebels had been intercepted and defeated, depriving Muentzer of much needed reinforcements. Muentzer, the new Gideon, was both prophet and general, but unaware that the roles might conflict. As their general, he assembled the peasant horde behind a barricade of battlewagons at the foot of Kyfhausen, a 470-meter-high hill outside of Frankenhausen. The troop deployment indicates Muentzer had studied the tactics of Jan Zizka, the great Hussite general. However, like Jan Zelivsky, Muentzer had not studied diligently enough to understand the wagons had to be deployed behind trenches at the top of the hill to have military effect. And, in the 100 years since Zizka, the technology of war had changed. The army Muentzer faced had artillery.

In his confrontation with Philip of Hesse, Muentzer acted like a prophet, not a general. Muentzer spread the impression among the rebellious peasants

that God was on their side and that numbers didn't matter. "Be bold," he told them, "and put your trust in God alone, and he will endow your small band with more strength than you would ever believe."[192] Muentzer told them God Himself had not only assured him of victory, they needn't fear the artillery of Philip and his Hessians because he, Thomas Muentzer, would catch their cannon balls in the sleeves of his cloak and fling them back upon them. God Himself would transform heaven and earth rather than see his people go down to defeat fighting the godless followers of Martin Luther. At the moment Muentzer finished his speech, a rainbow appeared in the sky. He took it as a sign of imminent success, filling his followers with courage and enthusiasm.

Their enthusiasm didn't last long. Philip claimed mendaciously that the peasants could all go home unharmed if they handed Muentzer over to him. Taken in by pretext, the peasants were lulled into letting the Hessians move dangerously close to their position. As soon as they were within artillery range, the Hessians opened fire on the unsuspecting peasants. Muentzer caught no cannonballs in the sleeves of his cloak. The peasants broke from behind their battlewagons and fled in panic across the open fields, where they were easy prey for Philip's heavy cavalry. In the ensuing slaughter, Philip of Hesse's troops slaughtered more than 6,000 peasants, losing only six of their own men. Blood flowed through the alleys of Frankenhausen, where the terrified peasants sought refuge, along with their leader, who was found cowering under a bed.

Muentzer was taken in chains to Count Ernst of Mansfeld's castle where he was interrogated and tortured. In a confession dated May 16, 1525, one day after he was captured, Muentzer admitted that in the Klettgau and Hegau regions, he had advanced propositions on how one should rule according to the gospel, but he insisted he was not responsible for the insurrections there because they were already in open rebellion. He preached to the people there not to incite them to rebellion, he insisted, but because Oecolampadius and Hugowaldus had asked him to. Lest they not believe him, the princes should consult the letters those two men had written to him, which could be found in a bag still in his wife's possession in Muehlhausen.

Under torture, Muentzer confessed that if he had captured the castle of Heldrungen, where he was being interrogated, he would have beheaded Count Ernst. Under torture, he claimed he began the rebellion so all Christians would be equal because he wanted to establish the fundamental principle "All property should be held in common."[193] Princes who disagreed "should be beheaded or hanged."[194]

Muentzer also justified his role in the execution of three prisoners by claiming he was carrying out "divine justice." George of Saxony urged him to repent for breaking his vow of celibacy. Perhaps in response, Muentzer asked that his wife and child not suffer and that they be allowed to keep his possessions. Philip of Hesse tried to engage Muentzer in theological disputes,

and to get him to disavow the Old Testament as a suitable basis for political authority. Muentzer "refused to make the expected confession, and instead with his last strength, he urged the princes to burden the poor people no more, and to immerse themselves in the Old Testament Books of Kings in order to learn how the office of rulership could be held in a manner pleasing to God."[195] So, in political matters, Muentzer remained impenitent to the end. Some insisted the rest of his confession and retractions were ambiguous, but his last words, spoken "at Heldrungen in my prison and at the end of my life. May 17, 1525"[196] seem clear: "I wish to express this now, as my last words, with which I want to remove the burden from my soul, so that no further rebellion take place and so that no more innocent blood is shed."[197]

Heinrich Pfeiffer had left before the battle with a troop of 300 men and tried to break through the princes' lines to link up with rebel troops in Franconia, but he was captured near Eisenach and brought back to Muehlhausen, which had surrendered without a fight on May 25. On May 27, 1525, Muentzer and Pfeiffer were decapitated outside the walls of Muehlhausen. Christ, not Gideon, had the last word. Those who lived by the sword died by it. Muentzer's early claim that, if anyone could prove him wrong, he "deserved to have his head chopped off,"[198] was apparently fulfilled. The heads of Muentzer and Pfeiffer were impaled on one set of poles, their bodies on another set. Muehlhausen endured draconian sanctions, from which it never recovered economically. The warning was clear. Those who took the sword into their own hands would die by the sword wielded ruthlessly by princes justified by Luther.

But other warnings were necessary too. Luther had ripped Scripture from its matrix in the Church and turned Scripture into an instrument of revolution. If there were no court of final appeal in the magisterium of the Church, who was to tell Muentzer he was wrong when he claimed scripture and private revelation justified revolution? The Lutheran insistence on the absolute power of the princes created the notion they were above the moral law and contributed directly to the rise of absolutism and, indirectly, to the rise of totalitarianism. The dialectic of revolution was sure to continue despite the use of Muentzer's impaled head as a terrible deterrent against taking up the sword.

Muentzer's death insured a tradition of political repression, which, paradoxically, kept his memory and the hope of revolution alive long after the Anabaptist communities had abandoned revolutionary activity. Muentzer's martyrdom insured, in the words of Friedrich Engels, "The German people, too, [would] have their revolutionary tradition."[199] When the communists took over Thuringia in the wake of World War II, they renamed Muehlhausen Thomas Muentzer-Stadt to prove, again in Engels' words, that "There was a time when Germany produced characters who could match the best men in the revolutions of other countries, when German people displayed an endurance and vigor, which would in a more centralized nation have yielded

the most magnificent results, and when German peasants and plebeians were full of ideas and plans that often made their descendants shudder."[200] As Heinrich Heine would make clear, that revolutionary shudder began with the Reformation. "It seems to me that a methodical people like the Germans had to begin its philosophical preoccupations with the reformation and that they could only bring them to completion by going over to revolution."[201]

Less than ten years after Muentzer's death, revolution broke out again, at the opposite end of the Germanies, fueled by Muentzer's example and his judaizing Old Testament theology.

Chapter Ten

The Anabaptist Rebellion

Hermann Kerssenbroick, who witnessed the Anabaptist Rebellion in Muenster, felt the events were foretold by celestial warnings years in advance. On October 11, 1527, at four a.m., a marvelous sign appeared in the heavens. All across northern Europe men said they saw a bent arm holding in its hand a two-edged sword, on either side of which dark stars were arrayed. At the sword's point a larger and brighter star was visible. Then in the clouds on either side of the two-edged sword, men saw bloody swords mixed with decapitated heads. The vision caused great distress and consternation. Kerssenbroick said many who saw it went mad.

That madness was reflected in Germany during the 1520s. The Peasants' War followed close on the heels of Luther's break with Rome, reaching its bloody conclusion in 1525. Two years after the vision of the bloody sword, a disease known as the English Sweats swept the Germanies, presaging, in Kerssenbroick's words, "a horrible catastrophe among men."[1] Also in 1529, Holy Roman Emperor Charles V became concerned about the spread of a heresy that denied baptism to infants and so, in an age of high infant mortality, denied many children the beatific vision. Concerned that the sect of rebaptizers, known in Germany as the *Wiedertaueffer* and in England as the Anabaptists, was spreading heresy and insurrection, Charles ordered their extermination. The princes, recognizing the revolutionary consequences of Anabaptist religious beliefs, obliged. Henry VIII burned a dozen Anabaptists at the stake in England. Luther detested the Anabaptists and urged the German princes to follow Henry's example.

Luther saw the connection between his erstwhile disciple Thomas Muentzer and the Anabaptists and, because the connection was apparent to others too, distanced himself from the Anabaptists by the vehemence of his denunciation. The Anabaptists, according to Luther, had abandoned Christian doctrine, and had arrogated to themselves the power of the sword that rightly belonged to magistrates alone. They used religious enthusiasm to spread sedition and revolution wherever they gained a foothold, just as the whoring, thieving spawn of Muentzer had. Even Zwingli, a judaizing political revolutionary

without qualms about taking up the sword, denounced them too. Even though many Anabaptists claimed to be pacifists, when Zwingli died in 1531 the Anabaptists were the cutting edge of the revolutionary upheaval sweeping central Europe under the banner of reformation.

By 1530, the main focus of Anabaptist activity was the Low Countries of the north, especially the Westphalian city of Muenster. Perhaps it was the similarity in the names Muentzer and Muenster, but Muenster became inextricably linked in the popular mind with the Peasant Rebellion that Muentzer orchestrated in Thuringia five years before. Contemporary doggerel reinforced the connection: "The crowd from Muenster hoped for renown/By bringing the peasants into their town."[2]

Ditties like this were passed around by word of mouth and by the rudimentary broadsheets and newspapers that were the second fruits of the invention of the printing press. The first fruit was political unrest, due to publication of Luther's translation of the Bible. The anonymous author of the "*Newe Zeitung, die Wiedertaueffer zu Muenster belangend*," emphasized the connection between Muenster and Muentzer: "Since the Muensterites abandoned God's word . . . God afflicted them with grave errors and lust . . . Thomas Muentzer tried to do the same with the help of his rebellious peasants and perished miserably."[3] The political stakes and dangers were much higher in the 1530s than in the 1520s. All of the wickedness of the Bohemian Taborites which Muenster had brought into southern German speaking lands burst forth much more virulently and threatened to spread through the north and to drag into chaos over a thousand years of patiently erected social order.

In 1525, the revolutionary fervor of the Peasant Revolt arrived in Muenster, whose name derived from the Latin word for monastery, and which had been a bishopric since 805, i.e., for roughly half of the life of the Catholic Church. As elsewhere, the monasteries were the focus of the ire of the reformers, who played on the resentments of the common man. The numerous churches, convents and monasteries paid no property taxes to the city. And the monasteries and convents ran their own businesses in this town of slightly more than 9,000, with monks and nuns working at looms producing cloth and tapestries that competed with the laymen in the same business who had to pay taxes and provide for their families.

Facing rebellion spreading to Muenster from the south, Prince Bishop Frederich von Wied granted the city unprecedented independence from Church authority. After the disturbances of 1525, Muenster was ruled by a council of 24, two of whom functioned as co-mayors. In 1532, the guilds, full of resentment at the monasteries, placed their candidates on the town council and then forced them to install Lutheran preachers in the town's churches. As word spread that the unvarnished Gospel was being preached there, Muenster became a magnet for the disaffected. Unruly monks and nuns as well as "the propertyless, the uprooted and the failures"[4] converged on Muenster. Freedom

was the magic word which drew "the Dutch and the Frisians and scoundrels from all parts who had never settled anywhere: they flocked to Muenster and collected there," bringing with them "fugitives, exiles, criminals" and "people who having run through the fortunes of their parents were earning nothing by their own industry . . . growing weary of poverty, they thought of plundering and robbing the clergy and the higher Burghers."[5] Cohn emphasizes economic factors, claiming the collapse of the cloth industry in Flanders had sent the weavers to Holland, "which now contained the greatest concentration of insecure and harassed proletarians. . . . it was amongst such people that Anabaptism flourished in its most militant and crudely chiliastic form; and it was such people who now streamed into Muenster."[6] Emphazising economic causes, Cohn ignores the leadership role which rebellious, judaizing priests played in the movement and the fact that a Catholic priest infected with messianic politics through exposure to a distorted Old Testament brought revolutionary chaos to Muenster.

By the early 1530s, Bernard Rothmann (or Rottman) was an itinerant preacher who brought political unrest wherever he preached. Like Muentzer, Rothmann began his revolutionary career as an "earnest intellectual who had studied with the great Melanchthon, Luther's disciple."[7] Rothmann began preaching in Muenster without permission of the bishop or any other ecclesial authority and soon gained a following because of his fiery sermons. The bishop, as a result, asked the town council to expel him. Rothmann's uncle evidently agreed with the bishop's assessment, giving his nephew a bag of gold coins and sending him in 1530 for instruction in Cologne, a bastion of Catholic orthodoxy. Rothmann never arrived in Cologne. When he returned to Muenster one year later, he proclaimed he was no longer a Catholic priest but rather a confirmed Lutheran who planned to put Lutheran doctrines into effect in the town's churches. He soon led a mob to St. Mauritz Church, his former parish, and goaded them into an orgy of iconoclasm. The elaborate wooden altar was toppled, smashed into splinters, and then dragged into the church courtyard, where it was set on fire along with the paintings of the Blessed Virgin that the mob had torn from the church's walls. The sacred vessels of silver were crushed or melted down for secular use. Rothmann soon expanded his ministry to other churches with similar results. He preached at the Overwater Church Convent that it would soon crumble and fall into the River Aa, which ran through town. He also told the nuns they had to abandon their vows of celibacy, as he had evidently done. "You must have men; you must marry; you must bear children," Rothmann told the nuns because "the Heavenly Father has also favored me with a direct and special revelation to the same effect."[8] When the collapse of the convent did not occur when he predicted, Rothmann's stature remained undiminished because he was preaching a gospel many nuns were avid to hear.

Unsurprisingly, the bishop continued to pressure the town council to expel Rothmann. The town council continued to ignore the bishop, primarily because Rothmann had gained the ear of one of the town's most influential businessmen, the cloth merchant Bernard Knipperdolling, who was no friend of the bishop. A few years earlier, Bishop von Wied had Knipperdolling kidnapped while on a business trip and held him prisoner for six months until he was ransomed. During his imprisonment, Knipperdolling became permanently crippled when his feet were forced into iron boots, crushing his toes.

Rothmann eventually published his "*Confession*" with the help of Knipperdolling, who had set up a printing press in the basement of his house on the market square in Muenster. Rothmann would become the Goebbels of Muenster, making use of the new communications technology, publishing fliers and pamphlets explaining the Anabaptist cause, leading like-minded Dutchmen to pour into Muenster to cast their lot with the revolutionary movement. According to Rothmann's *Confession*, "the so-called Mass" wasn't a sacrifice, but rather "a sign of the true sacrifice."[9] Similarly, Christians did not have to do penance because Christ perfected and sanctified them by his perfect sacrifice once and for all. The fires of purgatory, "about which one is told that they cleanse the departed from the remnants of sin," were nothing more than a "godless invention."[10] There is only one intermediary between God and man, and that is "the man Jesus Christ." So anyone who prays to "dead saints," or invokes them as "guardian gods," denies the Christian faith.[11]

Certain political consequences flowed from this theology, according to Rothmann, no matter how much Luther and Melanchthon denied it. Rothmann conceded "man owes secular authority respect and obedience." But "as soon as the commands" of the secular authorities "no longer coincide with the word of God, we are no longer bound to follow them."[12] Kerssenbroick claims Rothmann's *Confession* meant "all power on earth now rested with *Demos*."[13] Since self-empowered preachers like Rothmann were now the definitive explicators of the word of God, neither the common man nor the princes held any real power in this world, or, if they did hold power, it was only at the pleasure of ex-priests like Rothmann. As in Prague over one hundred years earlier, political power was exercised by clever preachers like Rothmann and Jan Zelivsky, who knew how to manipulate the mob to achieve political results.

As in Prague, so in Muenster. The effects were not long in coming, and they were invariably destructive. Luther had compared revolution to a fire which each Christian had the duty to extinguish. Kerssenbroick watched the fire of rebellion spread through Muenster, with Rothmann's incendiary sermons spreading destruction wherever he preached. "And so it came to pass," Kerssenbroick wrote of Rothmann, "that this evil, like a fire, grew steadily and consumed everything in its path. . . . Since the magistrates refused to

punish the rebels in our city and put an end to their predations, they went from vice to vice, rage to rage, from outrage to outrage, forward step by step, until they finally reached the point of Revolution."[14]

By February 1532, Muenster had become a Protestant town on a political trajectory that was leading it willy nilly from Lutheranism to Anabaptism and political revolution. In that month, a group of prominent citizens met in Knipperdolling's house and signed a pact, which in Arthur's words, "seems to foreshadow the American Founding Fathers' words two centuries later."[15] In the pact, Muenster's Lutheran elite "swore to devote their personal fortunes, their reputations and even their lives to the cause of freedom from oppression that Rothmann now symbolized for them."[16]

Egged on by Rothmann's incendiary sermons, the mob, largely "foreigners" from Holland and Friesland, many of whom were renegade monks and nuns, broke into St. Lambert's church and claimed it for their charismatic leader, who did not have a church of his own. Rothmann commandeered the pulpit to preach "evangelical freedom" and the abolition of idol worship, which so enflamed his audience that "they broke into all of the parish churches in Muenster and destroyed the chalices and other sacred vessels used during the Mass, ripped down the curtains before the altar, destroyed paintings, and stole all of the churches' treasures, profaning all holy things and holding nothing for holy which did not correspond to Rothmann's teachings."[17] The desacralization of the Mass and the vessels associated with it led, in Kerssenbroick's eyes, to "turning the Republic upside down,"[18] his term for Revolution.

Huge fires consumed wax votive candles, priestly vestments, paintings and tapestries. A massive book burning took place in the market square: Latin Bibles, devotional texts, as well as secular works from personal libraries—the philosophical works of Boethius and Thomas Aquinas, the poetry of Horace and Chaucer, and the engravings of Heinrich Aldgrever and the paintings of Ludger tom Ring . . . all fed the swirling flames.[19]

When Bishop Friedrich, the Count of Wied, saw "these evils were going to spread unpunished throughout the town," he considered it "more advantageous to renounce his episcopal dignity," as Kerssenbroick puts it, "than to come to grips with the situation, quell the dangerous unrest, and to tame the authors of the already mentioned unrest."[20] So Bishop Friedrich von Wied sold the bishopric and the income which accrued from it and retired to Cologne.

Perhaps Bishop Friedrich invoked the ancient disclaimer "Caveat emptor" when he sold Muenster. If not, he should have. Muenster would be a devilish trial and monstrous expense for his successor. The buyer of the bishopric was another Prince Bishop, Franz von Waldeck, who did not observe the vow of celibacy because he was not a priest. Nor did he practice the virtue of chastity. Von Waldeck had fathered an illegitimate son by a mistress. If he had any religious sympathies, they were those of his kinsman Philip of Hesse, who had crushed the Peasant Revolt in 1525. Philip, like Franz von Waldeck, was

a strong believer in law and order, as long as it was his law and his order. As a leading Anabaptists would note, Philip differed from the Anabaptists only because the power of his armies imposed not law but the will of the sovereign over the chaos which Lutheran principles, ultimately, yet invariably, engendered.

Knipperdolling and Rothmann soon challenged the new Prince-Bishop by banning the Catholic Mass, a gesture of theological effrontery tantamount to an act of war. They also proscribed receiving communion, prayers for the dead, the use of Latin, the "worship" of Mary, "smearing oil" on the dying, and other instances of "disgusting idolatry."[21] Knipperdolling appointed an armed guard to protect Rothmann from attempts the bishop might make to arrest him. In place of the Mass, Rothmann instituted the feast of fools, a religious service with disturbing similarities to the *festus fatuorum* celebrated during Carnival, when the world was turned upside-down. Like similar services in Prague under Jan Zelivsky, renegade monks and nuns would smear excrement on sacred vessels and images, proving, Rothmann would later explain to the mob, that the Mass was a worthless empty ritual, especially compared to the drinking and singing and carousing Rothmann's service provided as its substitute. After Muenster had overthrown the bishop and installed its own "tailor king," to use Luther's term, Rothmann would conduct similar services in the town's ruined Cathedral. Mass would begin with the mob desecrating the altar by throwing things like cats' heads, dead rats, and horses hooves onto it, followed by a blasphemous play during which "monks" would lift their robes and fart in unison, followed by Rothmann's explanation: "Dear brothers and sisters, all the Masses in the world are exactly as holy and sanctified as the one you have just seen."[22] Kerssenbroick felt all the "poisonous beliefs that had been festering" in Rothmann's soul finally broke out in series of frenzied denunciations of the Catholic Church," which included "disparaging references to infant baptism and to the holding of private property."[23]

The town council, which was Lutheran, considered Rothmann and Knipperdolling their own, but both had secretly converted to the religion of the Anabaptists. Knipperdolling had been secretly re-baptized by the Elijah from Leyden, the semi-literate baker Jan Matthias (or Matthys), who had in turn been re-baptized by Melchior Hoffmann, one of the founders of Anabaptism. Hoffmann, like many of his disciples, had first been a Lutheran. He soon became a disciple of Zwingli and then he became "the Anabaptist apostle of the north." In 1533, Hoffmann ended up in Strasbourg, where he predicted the imminent end of the world and was thrown into prison. Hoffmann spent the next (and final) ten years of his life in a cage in a tower of the town. Deprived of their leader, Hoffmann's followers changed the site of the imminent second coming from Strasbourg to Muenster.

Hoffmann's mantle as the Elijah of the last days fell to the new Elijah of the North, Jan Matthias, who re-baptized Knipperdolling and who would soon

preside in Muenster over the arrival of the Millennium. During the late 1520s or early 1530s, Matthias received a new revelation from the Lord informing him that Hoffmann was wrong in advocating pacifism. The Anabaptists were no longer to turn the other cheek. Now they were to take up the sword and usher in the Millennium, with Jehovah and his Old Testament prophets and warrior kings as their model. Thousands of disaffected proletarians, weavers, and monks responded to his call to arms and streamed into Muenster.

Luther and Melanchthon thought Rothmann was mentally unstable. Melanchthon, Luther's colleague and Rothmann's erstwhile mentor, felt the Anabaptists were thieves and murderers and should be treated accordingly. "The kings of the Old Testament, not only the Jewish kings but also the converted heathen kings, judged and killed the false prophets and unbelievers. Such examples show the proper office of princes. . . . it is plain that the worldly government is bound to drive away blasphemy, false doctrine, and heresies, and to punish those who hold to these things. This sect of Anabaptists is from the devil."[24]

The Anabaptist willingness to take up the sword of insurrection led Melanchthon to consider them murderers because "like murderers, they intended to subdue the land with the sword."[25] The Lutherans suspected the Anabaptists were manipulating the passions of the disaffected to achieve political ends. Melanchthon accused them of carrying on all kinds of fornication, "thus revealing their true sprit."[26] Melanchthon failed to mention the similarities between what he and Rothmann preached. One of the greatest was their shared emphasis on *Sola Scriptura*. Luther had translated the Bible into German in 1522. After ten years of intensive promotion and distribution in the German speaking lands, the Bible as the text which needed no Church to interpret it was having demonstrable political effects, although not the ones anticipated by Luther and Melanchthon. According to the conventional wisdom, the Bible freed from the Church's hegemony led to independent thinking. "When Luther translated the Latin Bible into everyday German," Arthur tells us, "he released millions from dependence on the priests for their instruction."[27] In reality, Luther's translation led to judaizing, even though Luther was urging the German princes to confiscate the property of the Jews and subject them to forced labor.

"The inevitable result of millions of people being encouraged to think for themselves," Arthur continues, "was resistance to arbitrary authority."[28] This was certainly not true in Muenster, where the principle of *Sola Scriptura* led very quickly to imposition of the most arbitrary and tyrannical authority imaginable, namely, the disordered passions of bakers, tailors, and renegade monks. Luther and Melanchthon were horrified by what they saw in Muenster because events there showed the inadequacy of the idea that the Bible could interpret itself. The new hermeneutic of Biblical interpretation in Muenster was an elaborate rationalization, according to which first the lust and then

the power of the interpreter became synonymous with the truth. It was an idea Nietzsche proposed two and a half centuries later when he deconstructed Protestant exegesis into the will to power.

Sola Scriptura led first to judaizing and then to revolution for reasons which become clear upon reflection. Luther used rabbis to construct his text, and that text was, therefore, skewed in favor of judaizing. Beyond that, when the average man read the Bible with the admonition that he has the power to interpret it unaided by pope, priest, or council, certain things were obvious to him. First, he did not find the word "Trinity" in it. Secondly, he realized the Old Testament stories of Hebrews taking numerous wives and exterminating their enemies far outnumber the texts of the New Testament containing the admonitions of Christ. By sheer weight alone, the unsuspecting reader was led to judaizing unless corrected by a larger more powerful tradition. And Luther had discredited that larger tradition, no matter how much he hated the interpretations of those who invoked his name as a justification for their messianic politics. Bernard Rothmann, like Muentzer before him, was a pupil of Luther who took Luther's principles to their logical conclusions, even if Luther felt they were unwarranted. The best example of the law of unintended consequences came from the Lutheran doctrine of *Sola Scriptura*. Luther went out of his way to give the princes who supported him all temporal power, but *Sola Scriptura* invariably led to judaizing, and from judaizing it invariably led to revolution.

By 1532, the Emperor Charles V was hearing troubling reports about Muenster even in far away Regensburg. As a result, he ordered von Waldeck to do something. In October 1532, von Waldeck imposed a blockade on the city. As part of that blockade, he captured local cattle merchants who were driving a herd of oxen to market, confiscating the animals and holding the men in contempt of his blockade. Von Waldeck's actions inflamed local opinion against him. In retaliation, the rebels in Muenster raided the bishop's castle in nearby Telgte, capturing some of the bishop's men, who could then be used to ransom the cattle merchants. In February 1533, after an acrimonious back-and-forth, a settlement was signed; the bishop agreed to lift the blockade and the citizens of Muenster agreed to stop harassing the city's Catholics, to silence Rothmann and his associates, and to proclaim the traditional oath of submission to the bishop in May.

The agreement was never implemented. Thousands of newcomers flooded the city as a result of reading Rothmann's sermons, printed as pamphlets in Knipperdolling's basement. As the radicals arrived in greater numbers, the beleaguered Catholics left, radicalizing the town still further. Rothmann railed against private property in his pamphlets and encouraged immigration by hinting Muenster was willing to share its riches with anyone who came and proclaimed himself a member of the company of Christ. Since those who left were not allowed to take their property, there was, at least at the

beginning, enough material wealth to satisfy the needs, if not the desires, of the newly arrived revolutionaries, who in turn spread Muenster's fame as the New Jerusalem.

Months earlier, von Waldeck had warned the city council that "out of their own volition and without a proper Christian calling, quite a few vagabonds and wandering unknown fellows have penetrated our city of Muenster in order to incite the common man with their seductive and seditious teachings,"[29] not to mention with their increasing bold and defiant criminal activity. Shortly after von Waldeck's warning, the newly arrived radical preachers began organizing public baptisms on a large scale. One of those preachers was a tailor's apprentice from nearby Leyden, Jan Bokelzoon (or Beukelcz or Bockelson), known as Jan of Leyden. Bokelzoon had run an inn; some claimed he had been involved in prostitution. He had heard the dawning of the Millennium would take place in Muenster, whence he had come to baptize the already baptized. During one week at the end of 1533, 1,400 Catholics were re-baptized into the revolutionary faith. Bokelzoon had been re-baptized by Jan Matthys, who had commissioned him to go to Muenster. Together they would take up the sword and prepare the way for the Millenium by turning Muenster into the New Jerusalem.

Overwater Church Convent was greatly affected by the migration of newcomers. Forced to take in renegade nuns from all over Holland, Abbess Ida von Merveldt noticed the newcomers were corrupting the nuns under her charge. They were, she wrote to the bishop, becoming more and more difficult, refusing to follow the rubrics of the traditional services, insisting on singing the new hymns in German, refusing to wear their habits, and making life in the convent unbearable because of their disobedience. When Bokelzoon and the itinerant preachers arrived in Muenster, many nuns of the Overwater Church Convent presented themselves for re-baptism, to Ida von Merveldt's chagrin.

In January 1534, the mob, which contained many re-baptized nuns from the Overwater Convent, stormed St. Lambert's Church and claimed it for Rothmann. When the women were rebuked by the city councilors, they drove those who rebuked them back inside the city hall under a hail of pig and cow manure. Rothmann returned to Overwater Church Convent to preach on February 6. Rothmann had previously preached there, urging the nuns to violate their vow of celibacy and claiming the convent would fall into the river if they didn't. Since the date for the doom of the convent had come and gone, Rothmann began his remarks by claiming the predicted catastrophe was averted because the nuns "had seen the errors of their ways, causing God to be merciful."[30] The Anabaptists were resolutely Adventist, predicting the day and the hour when the world would end, and then re-interpreting in a suitably spiritual manner when it did not.

On February 8, Bokelzoon received a vision from the Lord announcing that Muenster had become the New Jerusalem. He ran naked through the streets of Muenster announcing that vision to the town's inhabitants, calling them to repentance. Soon the town's population, swollen with renegade monks and nuns who had put off their habits and taken on the new baptism, began to imitate Bokelzoon. The liberated nuns had visions of the coming apocalypse so intense that they would tear off their clothes and roll around in mud and dung, frothing at the mouth, screaming the end times had finally arrived.

The Anabaptists received unwitting assistance from Charles V and his Spanish troops in the Netherlands, whose severity in dealing with the new heresy drove many from their homes. If the severity of the Spanish troops was the stick, then Rothmann's *Flugschriften*, printed in Knipperdolling's basement, were the carrot. Rothmann portrayed Muenster as the new Promised Land, whose prosperity was based on the abolition of private property; all shared equally in the town's wealth. There was food and clothing for all in Muenster, and if that weren't incentive enough to abandon the old life in Egypt, there were the warnings about the coming times of tribulation. "No one should neglect to go along and thus tempt God to punish him, because there is an insurrection all over the world. As it is written in Jeremiah 51:6, the Lord decrees that every man must flee out of Babylon and deliver his soul, for this is the time of the Lord's vengeance. I do not simply tell you this," Rothmann continued, "but command you in the name of the Lord to obey."[31] If a man's wife and family were unpersuaded by the new gospel, the man should leave them behind to perish in the coming conflagration.

Subsequent behavior indicated that Rothmann and his messengers were getting the message out. On February 10, seven men and seven women tore off their clothes and, "having put the old Adam aside"[32] as Hoffmann had instructed, ran naked through Amsterdam. Arrested and thrown into jail, they persuaded their fellow inmates to throw off their clothes too. The need for clothing resulted from Adam's sin. Those who wore no clothes were saying Original Sin had been eliminated. The 14 who shed their clothes in Amsterdam were soon executed, but their beliefs spread through Holland as a result of Rothmann's pamphlets and the *Newe Zeitungen* or *New Newspaper* that reported on the bizarre behavior in Muenster. The incident repeated itself on March 22, with the same results for the Anabaptists, who this time marched through the streets bearing swords. By the time these Anabaptists were executed, thousands of like-minded Dutchmen had responded to a secret letter Matthys had signed as Emmanuel, urging the faithful to converge on Hasselt to embark for Muenster. The 15,000 pilgrims who heeded the call and converged on Hasselt were dispersed by Spanish troops and sent home. One hundred of their leaders were executed.

Among those migrants who got through was Jan Matthys, the Anabaptist Elijah, who had arrived in Muenster in February, preceded by Bokelzoon

and accompanied by his ex-Carmelite nun concubine, the beautiful Divara, a woman 20 years his junior, who invariably accompanied him as he stalked the streets of the New Jerusalem, uttering dire visions of death by the sword. During the turmoil leading up to the last days, Matthys had abandoned the pacifism of Melchior Hoffmann and had become an avid proponent of armed insurrection, in the typically judaizing fashion of those, like his predecessor Thomas Muentzer, who saw themselves as Old Testament prophets wielding the sword of Gideon. Once Matthys joined forces with Bokelzoon, Rothmann, and Knipperdolling, political power effectively transferred from the city council, then negotiating a settlement with the bishop, to the charismatic preachers who could manipulate the mob to intimidate the council into doing its bidding.

On the evening of February 9 and 10, 1534, the mob, whipped into a threatening frenzy by Bokelzoon, Matthys, and Rothmann, forced the city council to support its cause, a result the mob took as divine vindication of their efforts. Matthys now was effectively in charge of the theocratic state whose advent he had predicted in his sermons. Re-baptism had replaced the civic oath as the basis for citizenship in the New Jerusalem.

In late February, the mob forced election of a new city council, forcing the Lutheran and Catholic moderates who had negotiated the agreement with the bishop out of government and eventually out of town. Knipperdolling was elected mayor and shared power with Matthys and Bokelzoon, with Rothmann acting as their minister of propaganda. Four days later Matthys fell face first into the muddy slush in front of Muenster's Cathedral. When he regained consciousness and arose from the muck, revived from his trance, it was with a new vision for the New Jerusalem. "Drive away the sons of Esau," the told his followers.[33] Matthys ordered the council to expel all unbelievers from town. Matthys' followers then went house to house, routing those who refused re-baptism from their hiding places and assembling them in the market place, exposed without proper clothing, for their imminent expulsion. Those who were about to be expelled had their possessions plundered to swell the coffers of the city, which could now use their confiscated wealth to maintain newly arrived revolutionaries. Kerssenbroick, who was among those expelled, described women who "carried their naked nursing babies and begged in vain for rags to clothe them in."[34] Other women, "driven from their maternity beds, gave birth in the streets. Miserable children, barefoot in the snow, whimpered beside their fathers."[35] Offered the choice of re-baptism or expulsion from her native town in the dead of winter, one old woman told Matthys, "You may baptize me in the name of the devil, for I have already been baptized in the name of God."[36]

Once the 'godless' were expelled, the Elect celebrated in an orgy of drunkenness and destruction. Bursting into the Cathedral, the mob of the Elect destroyed ancient manuscripts, including the Bible, and smeared

paintings of the Blessed Virgin with excrement. They then broke into the tombs of deceased clergy and disinterred their bones, scattering them over the floor of the Cathedral. The brass pipes of the Cathedral's great organ were melted and made into shell casings. The stained glass windows were shattered and the high altar used as fuel for the fire that destroyed what they felt not worth defiling. Paintings were stripped from frames and consigned to the flames, the frames were then used as toilet seats in the guard houses on the city wall. Finally, the town clock in the Cathedral was destroyed. Now, as in other revolutions that followed, was the revolutionary year one.

The destruction was consistent with Jan Matthys' revolutionary vision, and that of many who would come after him. For the new world to begin, the old world had to be destroyed. Iconoclasm was not only an expression of hatred for the Catholic world, it was also a way of hastening the Millennium, the real thousand year reign of Christ on earth which began with their plundering. Matthy's theology of salvation through destruction had political purposes. If the symbols of Church and State, twin pillars of the social order, could be shown as vulnerable, then those who destroyed them proved, to themselves at least, that they now wielded the power. Spontaneous street theater paraded and then hanged the newly disempowered bishop in effigy. Houses with straw crosses over their doors, symbolizing their owners' allegiance to the bishop, were looted and their inhabitants dragged into the streets and beaten. The mob marched through the town singing obscene lyrics to the tunes of ancient hymns. The old order had been destroyed and freedom—or its simulacrum, license—reigned in its place.

Because the new Anabaptist council reneged on the agreement with the bishop, the city was forced to renegotiate. The bishop made what he felt was a more than reasonable offer, but the offer never made it to the city council. Herman Tilbeck, the mayor and chief negotiator, had secretly become an Anabaptist. Acting as Knipperdolling's agent, he pocketed the bishop's peace offer and delivered instead what he claimed was the bishop's dismissive rebuke. The offended council then sided with the truculent Anabaptists, and the bishop, thinking the council had rejected an offer that bespoke good faith and generosity, now had to resolve the issue by force of arms.

When the town council sided with the Anabaptists and rebuffed the bishop's offer, wild celebrations erupted in the streets of Muenster. The mob celebrated with "shameless abandon."[37] Men hopped in the mud and slush as if they almost possessed the ability to fly. Women let down their hair and then threw off their clothes and threw themselves into the mixture of snow, mud, and pig manure, where they lay with arms outstretched as if to embrace a new revelation pouring down on them from heaven. Perhaps influenced by the manure into which they pressed their faces, the women squealed like pigs as their co-religionists ran around in circles, uttering prophecies while frothing at the mouth. The world had succumbed to revolution and had been turned

upside down. The inversions of everyday life practiced once a year during carnival were now the norm. There was no sacrifice of the Mass anymore in the New Jerusalem; blasphemous parodies were now performed regularly by the revelers, dressed as priests, bishops and nuns, marching through the town singing songs with obscene lyrics parodying hymns. Reports of the revelry drew ever more like-minded people to the town. Slowly the voice of reason was extinguished, oftentimes by the brutal misguided actions of Bishop von Waldeck himself: Dr. Friedrich von Wyck, a lawyer from Bremen sent to negotiate a truce, was executed by the bishop, ending all possibility of a peaceful settlement.

When the denizens of the New Jerusalem awoke from their revelry on the morning of February 28, they beheld before their walls hundreds of laborers digging trenches and throwing up earthworks. The bishop's blockade had become a full-blown siege. The bishop had limited resources, but his kinsman, Phillip of Hesse, was as concerned about Anabaptism as he had been about the Peasants Revolt a decade earlier, and was willing to do whatever was in his power to stop it. The bishop had no artillery, so Philip supplied him two huge siege guns, known as the Devil and the Devil's mother. By May, the 8,000 soldiers in the bishop's employ had erected the rudiments of a four-mile-in-circumference wall of earthworks, moats, and blockhouses, which with increasing effectiveness would cut Muenster off from the outside world. The bishop's expenses were enormous, plunging his bishopric into debt for centuries to come. From the viewpoint of the Anabaptists, it seemed like money wasted. No one could defeat a city as impregnable as Muenster, they thought, certainly not someone with the limited resources of Franz von Waldeck, who had to spend 34,000 guilders a month just to keep his soldiers from deserting. Besides, God was on their side and would lead them to victory no matter how great the odds.

Like so many other tyrants, Matthys used the threat of war to consolidate his political power. As one of those measures, Matthys announced that those who were still in Muenster had no need of money; they should therefore deposit whatever gold and valuables they had with his agents, who would use it for the common good, as determined by the Elijah from Leyden. When a blacksmith complained, he was executed summarily, inaugurating a reign of terror that would soon reach unprecedented and legendary proportions. Rothmann obligingly wrote a pamphlet extolling the virtues of the now mandatory communism. Matthys took complete control of the flow of information in the town, burning all books save the Bible, whose interpreter he and he alone now was. The book banning and burning "deprived the inhabitants of Muenster of all access to theological speculations from the Fathers onwards and thereby assured the Anabaptist leaders of a monopoly on the interpretation of the Scriptures."[38]

Since Muenster was well-provisioned, protected by massive walls, with a river running through it that could fill moats and provide drinking water, the Anabaptists were not overly concerned about the siege. Life in Muenster quickly devolved into a routine of boredom punctuated by random death. To relieve the boredom of the siege, the bishop's soldiers snuck up to Muenster's walls under the cover of darkness and nailed torn pants to the town gates. Then in the light of the following day, they would call out, "Tailor," referring to Bokelzoon's previous occupation, "patch my old and torn pants."[39]

In symbolic retaliation, the Anabaptist soldiers made a cloth dummy, which they stuffed with hay and then decorated with mock papal bulls and indulgences. Then, tying it to an old mare, they drove the mare out of town towards the bishop's encampment. When that made little impression, they filled a large barrel with human excrement and sent it on the back of a driverless wagon. The bishop's soldiers often competed to see who could get closest to the city's walls and expose his buttocks to the city's defenders. One boy in the bishop's service made the mistake of doing this in the same place several days running, enabling the Anabaptist soldiers to train a field piece on the spot. Watching the young lad pull down his pants for his last performance, the Anabaptists scored a direct hit on his naked buttocks, "scattering his limbs," in Kerssenbroick's words, "so far and wide over the field that it was impossible to find them and bring them together for burial."[40] Emboldened by the security of the city's walls, the Anabaptists daringly raided the bishop's camp. During one raid, the Anabaptists pounded steel nails into the firing holes of 19 of the bishops' cannons. The raid would have permanently disabled the cannons, but one of the bishop's men created "a particularly artful and easy to use drill"[41] which opened up the firing holes and rendered the cannons serviceable again.

Even an enthusiast like Matthys understood that without reinforcements from the thousands of Anabaptists and their sympathizers in nearby Holland, Muenster's Anabaptists were doomed. Matthys was waiting for good news from his Dutch supporters while attending a wedding on Good Friday, April 3, when he learned the Dutch rescue mission had been captured, causing him to fall into a swoon. After regaining consciousness, Matthys announced to the wedding guests that he had received another vision, which filled him with foreboding. God had informed the prophet from Leyden that he should put on the armor of battle and go forth by himself to defeat the bishop's army single-handedly, just as David had defeated Goliath. The day of the appointed battle was two days hence, on Easter Sunday, before the city's walls at high noon. A token honor guard would accompany the prophet, who was now the New Jerusalem's warrior king as well.

Cynics who claim enthusiasm is simply a cover for self-serving appetite would do well to contemplate the actions of the judaizing leader of the Westphalian Jerusalem. As the old man in full armor, carrying not a stone

and sling, but a lance and sword, rode through the Ludger Gate and toward Miller's Hill, he was met by 500 of the bishop's elite shock troops, the Black Knights, who cut the prophet and his men into pieces. Kerssenbroick tells us that "every limb and part of 'the new Samson' was run through with countless sword thrusts until he was entirely in pieces."[41] The Black Knights then fought over the prophet's body parts as trophies. One knight took Matthys head and stuck it on the end of a pole which he displayed to the horrified Anabaptists watching from the city walls. Another took his testicles and nailed them to one of the city's gates. It was not a good day for dramatic prophetic gestures.

The demise of Elijah from Leiden posed a problem for those who aspired to succeed him as head of the New Jerusalem. Matthy's actions proved he was sincere in his beliefs, but they also proved dramatically that he was self-deluded. If the remaining triumvirate were suspected of self-delusion also, the legitimacy of charismatic leadership would be called into question. Bokelzoon stepped boldly into the political vacuum, announcing he had known all along that Matthys was going to die because God had revealed that to him in a vision. "The terrible end of Jan Matthias was revealed to me eight days ago by the Holy Ghost," Bokelzoon announced.[43] Some claimed Bokelzoon encouraged Matthys in his delusions so his rival would be killed and he could replace him as head of Muenster's government. They found vindication for their suspicions when Bokelzoon also announced the Holy Spirit told him, "When he is dead, you must marry his widow."[44] The Anabaptists' visions invariably revolved around sex and power and the gratification of the visionaries' passions. If the crowd had momentary doubts about Bokelzoon's vision, those doubts were erased when Knipperdolling jumped to his feet and announced Bokelzoon's vision was indisputably true. Relieved to hear that the New Jerusalem was still legitimate, the crowd tore off its clothing and began to dance in celebration. The dancing was appropriate: the New Jerusalem was based on the celebration of appetite, sanctified by messages which its devotees claimed as emanating from the Holy Spirit or interpretations of the Old Testament. Knipperdolling, as his well-timed endorsement of Bokelzoon's vision indicated, may well have conspired with Bokelzoon to get the older Matthys out of the way. Before long Knipperdolling was having visions of his own.

In April 1534, Knipperdolling announced in the Market Square that the Holy Spirit had told him exalted places must be made low and the lowly exalted. As the besotted mob stood slack-jawed wondering what his words meant, Knipperdolling interpreted his dream by announcing that the city's three architectural firms would tear down the steeples of the town's churches. The architectural patrimony of the city known as the Jewel of Westphalia was to be razed.

Not to be outdone, Bokelzoon soon had visions of his own. Running naked through the town, Bokelzoon bellowed to the still sleeping residents of the New Jerusalem, "You men of Israel, who live within the holy walls of

Zion, fear the Lord your God and do penance for the sins of your former lives. Convert! Convert! The Glorious King of Zion is ready with thousands of angels to descend to earth at the sound of terrifying trumpets to judge you. Mend your ways! O, mend your ways!"[45]

Bokelzoon turned to Knipperdolling for confirmation, but that worthy was incommunicado because he was having visions of his own. So Bokelzoon continued. "The father has revealed to me that the New Israel is in need of a new constitution. The previous Magistrates received their commission from the law of man. Now a new divine constitution will be inaugurated." The prophet needed to find 12 men whom he knew were especially disposed toward him. God had commanded Bokelzoon to do the same; so Bokelzoon appointed 12 of his followers as the "elders" of the New Jerusalem and successors of the 12 tribes of Israel, granting to them, according to Kerssenbroick, "all official power, in matters spiritual and secular."[46]

Now it was Rothmann's turn to vouch for Bokelzoon's vision. In a speech to those assembled to hear Bokelzoon, Rothmann said "God was the source of his speech and the citizens of the New Jerusalem should heed his words, just as God's own beloved people the Israelites had done in the past." After Rothmann's endorsement, the elders were summoned by name to kneel before Bokelzoon, who handed each of them a naked sword. Knipperdolling was given the special title of "*Schwertfuehrer*," granting to him the right to decapitate by sword anyone who questioned the ordinances of the New Zion. In conclusion, Bokelzoon led the assembly in singing the hymn, "*Allein Gott in der Hoeh sey Ehr.*"[47]

In early May, the bishops' troops began work on a dam that would drain the moat surrounding the town, opening an avenue of attack at the Judenfelder Gate. On May 16, the Anabaptists intercepted a supply convoy intended for the bishop's troops, killing 30 soldiers, and destroying 16 cannons and a large supply of gunpowder. On May 22, the bishop's forces began their barrage, lobbing 700 cannonballs a day for several days at the city's gates and towers. On the day before the planned attack, a group of the bishop's soldiers got drunk and, mistaking sunset for sunrise, attacked the town ten hours early only to get lost in the ensuing darkness. As a result, the first assault on the town failed, and the Anabaptists were convinced the God of Israel had saved them from the assault of the numerically superior Philistine army.

It wasn't just the Anabaptist leaders who saw parallels between the Old Testament and the plight of God's people in Muenster. Because in theory the common man could interpret the Scriptures, an orgy of democratic judaizing followed quite naturally. About the time that Jan Matthys went to his death as the New David, a 15-year-old Dutch girl, Hille Feyken, heard a sermon based on the Old Testament account of Judith and Holofernes and became obsessed with the idea that she was New Judith, destined to break the siege by using her feminine charms to seduce and then dispatch Bishop von Waldeck. When

young Hille ran the idea by Rothmann and Knipperdolling, they thought it unlikely to succeed. But neither felt that the teenage girl's life was worth enough to jeopardize the unlikely chance that the plan might work.

On June 16, the New Judith sallied forth from Muenster, "adorned with beautiful ornaments, whose art made her innately beautiful form that much more beautiful,"[48] bearing 12 Guilden, three rings with jewels, and a linen shirt, formerly owned by a leper, which had been soaked in poison. The bishop, according to Hille's plan, and approved by the highest levels of the Anabaptist regime, would be so enthralled by his lust for Hille that he would don the shirt in the throes of passion and die immediately, or have his head cut off by Hille when distracted by the pain, thereby ending the siege and liberating the people of God from their Philistine oppressors. How could a plan this clever fail to succeed?

Hille was captured as soon as she left the city and taken to Theodor von Merfeld, who questioned her closely after taking away her money and jewelry. Why, von Merfeld wanted to know, had she left her native town and gone over to the religious nuts who had taken over Muenster? Hille claimed she had been deceived and wanted to set things right by showing the bishop's soldiers secret passages that would enable them to capture the city with a minimum of casualties. Unfortunately for her, another citizen of the New Zion defected at the same time. Herman Ramert, who had taken in Bokelzoon when he first arrived in Muenster, was also brought before von Merfeld; he betrayed Hille's mission as the New Judith. Hille was then tortured, and under torture she admitted her role in the plot against the bishop. She was beheaded, suffering the fate of Holofernes, not Judith. Despite that minor modification, her vision was accurate.

After Hille's tragic adventure the bishop's troops refused to take prisoners. Not even women and children would be spared. Bokelzoon, according to the feminist interpretation of the Hille Feyken incident, needed to regain the initiative over the newly insurgent women. According to that interpretation, Bokelzoon introduced polygyny shortly after Feyken's failed mission because 'the Muensterites' leader was concerned about keeping women under control and about preventing such independent actions in the future."[49] Bokelzoon's contemporaries claimed he introduced *Vielweiberei* because he lusted after Matthy's beautiful widow. Besides, women outnumbered men three to one in the New Zion. The men, so the claim went, would have to care for unattached women. The simplest explanation, however, has to do with the passions that fueled the revolution in the first place. Men came to Muenster to gratify their passions for women and gold. Great thinkers like Rothmann had to come up with a justification of the passions driving their revolution. Where Rothmann would find the justification for those passions was a foregone conclusion.

In mid-July 1534, Bernard Rothmann preached on the passage in Genesis 1:22 where God commanded his creatures to "be fruitful and multiply." The

only way man could accomplish that while saving the unattached ex-nuns from their own lusts was to institute polygyny. One man was now to have several wives. Thereafter, polygyny was mandatory. All females 12 years of age or older had to be married. Bokelzoon would lead by example, taking 16 wives. Rothmann directed listeners to the examples of Abraham and David, both of whom had many wives.

There was some logic to polygyny in Muenster, and Rothmann did his best to make it sound as plausible as possible despite the shock to people from a culture where polygyny had disappeared a millennium earlier. Sexual relations outside of marriage were sinful, Rothmann noted. Because they had to be fruitful and multiply in a New Jerusalem where women outnumbered men three to one, the examples culled from the Old Testament made polygyny sound reasonable. None of these arguments, even in combination, would have carried the day, though, but for the heady atmosphere of revolutionary millennial expectation that abrogated all former laws and customs. Revolution was largely passion rationalized by an appeal to Old Testament models. A revolutionary leader could impose whatever regimen he chose in the name of his interpretation of God's law. So Bokelzoon and Rothmann declared all former marriages invalid.

Although Arthur tries to make Bokelzoon's decision sound plausible, in the end he to admits "the only way [Bokelzoon was able] to salvage his movement was to institutionalize his own perversity, to make adultery, bigamy and fornication the law of his strange land because he declared that it was the word of God."[50] "In the end," Gresbeck writes, Bokelzoon's male followers "took whatever women they could find. They wanted to have women whether or not they were fertile. . . . Thus they slept first with one woman and thereafter with another. Such they did with an aura of saintliness since they wanted to increase the population."[51] Passion thus became the law of the land. Force was the only thing that could adjudicate conflicting passions, and the revolution meant the rule of the strong over the weak, with no moral law intervening for the weak.

Menno Simons, founder of the Mennonites, distanced himself from the excesses of fellow Anabaptists in Muenster and from Bokelzoon's "blasphemy." He urged his wing of the Anabaptist movement to "consent to no other arrangement than the one which was in vogue in the beginning with Adam and Eve, namely, one husband and one wife, as the Lord's mouth has ordained."[52] Simons, however, was not in Muenster, and his views did not prevail there. Cohn, for once, is forced to come up with a non-economic explanation of the Anabaptists' behavior. "The Patriarchs of Israel had given a good example," he writes, "the polygamy which they had practiced must be restored in the New Jerusalem."[53] Here as elsewhere, the dynamic of revolution is the same: passion rationalized by appeals to the Old Testament as the *vis movens* for messianic politics.

Bokelzoon's resurrection of Old Testament polygamy was also a powerful recruiting tool, not just with revolutionary Dutchmen, but with the bishop's soldiers outside the walls. Bombarded by Rothmann's leaflets extolling Muenster as the New Jerusalem of communism and free love, 200 of the bishop's mercenaries defected and went over to the Anabaptists.

A policy this novel and this draconian was bound to cause a reaction. As Menno Simons' response indicates, many initially drawn to Anabaptism were unaware polygyny was part of the deal. Henry Mollenheck was devoted to the new gospel but equally devoted to his wife. He organized a group of soldiers in Muenster who thought they had been punished unjustly for drunken carousing; they captured Bokelzoon, Knipperdolling, and Rothmann on the evening of July 30 and locked them up in the cellar of the Muenster city hall. When Hermann Tillbeck, the former mayor, heard about the coup, he organized a counter-coup with 600 soldiers who released the captives and put Mollenheck and his men in the cellar in their place. Bokelzoon was in no mood to show mercy "toward the enemies of the Lord." Mollenheck and his men were beaten by the mob as they were dragged out of the building to be executed. The women, evidently avid to become concubines of the Elect in the New Jerusalem, were more vicious than the men, cursing them and stripping the clothes from their backs on their way to the scaffold. "No pen," Kerssenbroick wrote, "can describe the rage with which their adversaries fell upon them, and the refinements of cruelty to which they became victims."[54]

Forty-nine counterrevolutionaries were executed on the spot, and Bokelzoon capitalized on the passions the incident unleashed by taking Matthy's widow as his wife, since "no one remained to offer opposition," as Kerssenbroick put it.[55] Bokelzoon's decisive act legitimatized the passions of his followers, and they "rushed to follow his example." The former nuns, in particular, "gave themselves over to license and debauchery." The entire town witnessed "outrageous scenes of immorality" as Bokelzoon's followers outdid each other in committing one villainy after another "to satisfy their abominable lusts." Monks and nuns who formerly lived like angels on earth by following the vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, descended to the level of "foul and furious beasts."[56]

On August 28, the bishop launched a second attack, which was thwarted this time not by his own derelict and drunken soldiers, but by the elements. Torrents of rain refilled the moats the bishop's troops had drained; many of his soldiers drowned trying to cross what they were told was going to be dry land. Once more Bokelzoon and his minions took the failure of the assault as a sign of God's favor and an indication of the righteousness of their cause. To his credit, Bokelzoon, mounted on a white horse, had fought bravely before the city's walls. Drenched by the rain, he slipped unscathed through the barrage of deadly projectiles aimed at him. Feeling vindicated, Bokelzoon had himself declared King of the New Jerusalem.

Instead of counterattacking to scatter the bishop's demoralized troops and open the way for Anabaptist reinforcements gathering in Holland, Jan the Tailor designed robes and jewelry appropriate to his new royal status. Johann Dusentschur, a goldsmith from nearby Warendof, had a vision that Bokelzoon was the reincarnation of King David, destined to rule the entire world, and the new insignia of his office made this clear. The golden globe on the golden chain around his neck was pierced by two swords, symbolizing that he had reunited the swords of temporal and spiritual power, pope and emperor, which Christendom had separated. Rothmann the propagandist quickly gave a judaizing interpretation of the king's new insignia. Bokelzoon was David, the priest and king who wielded both swords. Rothmann, according to Haude's reading, "justified the elevation of a king on the basis of the Old Testament, where the Jewish prophets proclaim that in the last days of the world God would erect a king."[57] According to Gresbeck, Dusentschur presented a sword to Bokelzoon, claiming he would rule with it until God took it from him. Dusentschur anointed Bokelzoon's head with oil, purportedly confirming Bokelzoon had inherited the throne of King David. "He will cast the mighty down and raise the lowly; he will seize the crown and the scepter and the throne of Saul. He will take in his hand the sword of justice and bring the divine word to all the peoples of the world."[58] Dusentschur also announced the "Trumpet of the Lord would sound thrice and that at the third blast all the inhabitants of the town must foregather at Mount Sion,"[59] *i.e.,* in the square in front of the cathedral. When word of this revelation reached the bishop's camp, the soldiers there periodically blasted on trumpets and then shouted over the walls that the end times had come.

Bokelzoon, not surprisingly, agreed with the goldsmith who anointed him, announcing that as "David, a humble shepherd, [was] anointed by the Prophet, at Gods' command, as the King of Israel. . . . Now I am given power over all nations of the earth, and the right to use the sword to the confusion of the wicked and in defense of the righteous. So let none in this town stain himself with crime or resist the will of God, or else he shall without delay be put to death with the sword."[60] Bokelzoon was clear about the extent of his kingdom: "I will still rule, not only over this city but over the whole world, for the Heavenly Father has said it should be so. My kingdom which begins today shall never fall."[61] Jan the Tailor was the new David destined to rule the world. To impress his subjects with his new dignity, he had his tailors create a scarlet robe, which he wore on all occasions. He had coins struck to reflect his destiny. One coin proclaimed "The Word has become Flesh and dwells in us." Another coin proclaimed "One King over all. One God, One faith, One Baptism."[62] Following his coronation, King Jan had a throne erected in the Market Square with a cloth of pure gold placed upon it. From this throne he would order athletic contests, mock masses, and impromptu decapitations as the sole ruler of the New Jerusalem.

King David Bokelzoon also offered a return to a more primitive, ethnically homogeneous nation state, the sort of aspiration that would culminate centuries later with the rise of National Socialism and Zionism. The Catholic Church, like the Roman Empire that preceded it, had relegated ethnicity to a subordinate status. Bokelzoon's New Jerusalem was what Bernard of Clairvaux would have termed the "vomit of Judaism." Muenster's New Jerusalem harkened to a more primitive period, when there was no distinction between temporal and spiritual powers. The new revolutionary, messianic, ethnic state was modeled on the tribes of Israel, God's chosen race on earth.

Bokelzoon, as Cohn notes, was premeditated and precise in the symbols he chose. From his throne in the Market Square, he dispensed Old Testament justice. On one side of his throne stood a page holding the Old Testament, "to show that the king was the successor of David and endowed with authority to interpret anew the Word of God—the page on the other side held a naked sword."[63] The constant, repeated reference to Muenster as the New Jerusalem indicated repudiation of Christ and his Church and the political and philosophical and cultural sophistication that went with it. In its place, Bokelzoon was "the new David" who ruled by divine decree. The incongruity between these decrees and the unruly passions of Bokelzoon's followers was ignored until their passions collided, as in the case of the men and women Bokelzoon and Knipperdolling beheaded.

The Judaizers in Muenster introduced a new form of government in which sovereignty was based not on tradition or law but on the covert manipulation of popular passion. Government now secured its subjects' allegiance by granting them permission to revoke the moral law, based on models culled from the Old Testament, leading to a tyranny far worse than what it overthrew. All these threads become apparent in the new articles of government Bokelzoon proclaimed as king. Kerssenbroick describes *in extenso* how the "articles of the king in Muenster were placed before the Israelites living in this city, according to which they could live under the banner of righteousness as true Israelites in the current kingdom. . . under John, their true king, who has been placed on the Throne of David."[64] The First Article stipulates "in the new Temple, there can be only one king, who rules the people of God with the sword of righteousness."[65] From that premise, "there can be no authority who is not ordained by God Himself." Anyone who opposes this new order shall be punished by death. All this is necessary so the "Babylonian tyranny of Priests and monks,"[66] who use violence and injustice to darken the righteousness of God, should be suppressed. Bokelzoon also promised his followers deliverance from all their trials by the coming Easter, and went on to say that if what he predicted did not come to pass, that they should treat him like a false prophet and a vicious person with the proper punishments."

Bokelzoon then purported to divide up all of Germany among his followers, since he would soon rule the entire world anyway, making the local butcher

the Elector Prince of Saxony, etc. In this he resembled, in Kerssenbro[illegible] eyes, the fairy tale hunter who sold the bear's pelt before shooting the bear.

The terror began shortly after Bokelzoon consolidated his power. [illegible] evening after dinner as Bokelzoon sat brooding on his throne in the Mar[illegible] Square, he ordered a prisoner brought to him, whom he then perso[illegible] beheaded. On September 25, Knipperdolling decapitated a woman [illegible] refused to have sexual relations with her "husband," i.e., a man who had [illegible] the new ordinances establishing polygyny to force her into his bed. Elizabe[illegible] Holshern prayed openly to her "heavenly father," beseeching him "if you are almighty," to "see to it that I never more in my life have to climb into [illegible] marriage bed."[67] Knipperdolling was so enraged that he cut her head off [illegible] his sword. One day later, Katherine Kockenbeckin was executed in simila[illegible] fashion for having sex with two husbands. Evidently the right to have more than one spouse did not extend to women. Sexual liberation was defined on male terms, and the women had the choice of going along or losing their heads.

During the few months when revolutionary government held sway in Muenster, the trajectory of passion which the Marquis de Sade would sketch out centuries later based on his experience with the French Revolution ran its full course. Men who indulged in the simple passions soon found them insipid, forcing them to indulge in perverse passions, which led to the criminal passions, and they in turn led to the murderous passions. As in every revolution worthy of the name, sex liberated from the bond of matrimony led, one way or another, to murder. And in the case of Bernard Knipperdolling, murder led to madness.

Shortly after murdering Holshern, Knipperdolling reappeared in Market Square with froth on his lips bellowing: "Repent, Repent of our sins all of our sins for the Lord sees and knows your evil ways."[68] After running around Market Square on all fours like a dog, he jumped up and performed a lewd dance, saying, "I have often danced this way before my women, and now the heavenly father commands me to do the same before my king."[69] King Jan was dumbfounded by the mad behavior of his erstwhile supporter, who, judging from his words, was playing the fool, giving credence to the suspicion that the two of them were living in a fool's paradise for what increasingly seemed likely to be a short time. Either the psychological pressure of living under siege had taken its toll on Knipperdolling's guilt-ridden psyche, or it was a test of the king's power. "Courage, brother!" Knipperdolling said to King Jan, "We go together, the king's fool and the fool-king, to do battle with the world."[70] King Jan was horrified; when he tried to speak he could only stutter. "By rights I should also be a king," Knipperdolling continued; "I made you king."[71] King Jan could tolerate the madness or the charade no longer, and falling from his throne, he ran from the square. Mad Knipperdolling sat on the throne, an affront which should have cost him his life. Instead, he was given three

months in prison. After his release, he announced publicly that an evil spirit had taken possession of his faculties.

It was a narrow escape for King Jan. A few more performances like that and the king's authority would evaporate. Knipperdolling's recantation, however, did nothing to relieve the psychological pressure of the siege. To break the ever-narrowing circle, King Jan sent out 27 preachers in October, to spread the Anabaptist gospel to neighboring towns and, more likely, to solicit support to break the siege. All were captured; 26 were executed summarily. Heinrich Graes survived because he was willing to return to Muenster as the bishop's spy. Thereafter, the bishop knew Bokelzoon's every move. Whenever Bokelzoon sent out preachers carrying Rothmann's pamphlets or emissaries with gold to buy weapons, the bishop's men were there to meet them.

The psychological pressure on the town increased as a result. Even King Jan was showing signs of the strain. In the middle of the night of October 23, the people of Muenster finally heard the trumpets that they had been waiting to hear. Instead of heralding the imminent arrival of the Lord, however, the trumpets called the groggy residents of Muenster to an impromptu banquet, as Dusentschur blew into his cow horn from his perch in the steeple of St. Lambert's church. Half-dreading they might be sent into a suicidal attack on the bishop's fortifications, the mob was relieved to learn of the banquet. The king arrived astride his white horse accompanied by his queen and their attendants. After Dusentschur announced "He has ordered that a great feast be prepared for you," the King and his Queen circulated through the banqueting crowd turning the feast into a weird parody of Holy Communion with King Jan telling the assembled, "I eat this and show forth the death of the Lord."[72]

Perhaps the constant reference to death caused the king's mood to change. He ordered a prisoner brought into the festivities and then promptly drew his sword and cut off his head. The headless corpse lay where it fell as the festivities continued unabated until dawn.

After his defeat in August, the bishop refused to authorize any more direct assaults on the town. Instead, he resolved to starve the Anabaptists into submission by tightening the ring of siege. By late 1534 he had erected six blockhouses at the crucial chokepoints in the four mile ring of fortifications around the city. One man, under cover of night and at great risk, might evade the blockade, but nothing of significance could get in or out of Muenster unless the bishop's troops permitted it.

On December 13, the bishop appeared before the Diet of Koblenz, where Catholic and Protestant supporters, fearing anarchy more than each other, pledged to depose "a certain unknown Tailor lately become king, who named himself the King of Zion and the New Jerusalem."[73] This Tailor King, as Luther called him, proposed to spread his teachings throughout the Christian world, and to bring about thereby "the overthrow of all Princes and Magistrates with fire and sword, and subordinate the entire German empire to his power."[74] At

the end of the diet, representatives from the states of the Lower and Upper Rhine renewed their pledges of support, promising reinforcements of infantry and cavalry as well as the gold needed to make the siege impenetrable.

King Jan had missed his opportunity following the defeat of the bishop's second assault in August. Now the Anabaptists were having increasing difficulty getting anything out of town. And when they did, the bishop's spies informed him in advance, preventing reinforcements. Shortly after the Diet of Koblenz solemnly resolved to bring Muenster to its knees, Bernard Rothmann composed a pamphlet entitled *Revenge* and planned to have copies run off on Knipperdolling's printing press and distributed to Anabaptists gathering in Holland. In *Revenge*, Rothmann harped on all the standard judaizing revolutionary themes: It was time for the Dutch to "turn their plowshares into swords" so that they and King Jan "wearing the armor of David" could avenge themselves on "all Babylonian power and extinguish all godlessness."[75]

On Christmas Eve 1534, Jan van Geelen, one of King Jan's Dutch agents, left Muenster with 1000 copies of Rothmann's pamphlet and gold to buy weapons. Van Geelen planned to rally supporters in Deventer, Groningen, Amsterdam, Delft, and Leyden. Around Easter, the time Bokelzoon had predicted for the deliverance of the city, they would attack the bishop's siege works from the rear while Bokelzoon's troops attacked from the other side. Five days later, Heinrich Graes slipped out of Muenster and reported the plot to the bishop. As a result, 1000 Anabaptists assembled in Groningen under the leadership of a prophet who called himself the Christ were defeated by the troops of the Duke of Gelderland. In March 1535, three ships full of Anabaptists were sunk along with their occupants as they sailed up the Ijssel to break the blockade and reach their beleaguered brothers in Muenster. The blockade and the bishop's spies were having their effect.

Graes's intelligence also revealed the blockade was having its effect internally. Fuel was gone, leaving most of population freezing in their homes in the dead of winter. The food situation was desperate. All of the horses in the town had been killed, but the meat was reserved for the king's court. Flour had disappeared shortly after the blockade began in earnest in January. Famine-induced lassitude was spreading. The promised deliverance on Easter Day, March 28, failed to materialize. Instead, Heinrich Graes, who had promised support from sympathizers in nearby Wesel, returned to town only to nail an open letter to the town's gate, announcing he was a spy in the employ of the bishop and that their hope for deliverance was in vain. "I know everything," Graes informed his former townsmen. "You can still save your lives if you will turn from your path and leave this godless business behind."[76]

In response to Graes's threat, King Jan resorted to more refined strategies of domination and distraction. The deliverance he had promised was a spiritual deliverance, he told his now apathetic subjects. By April, every pet, rodent, and vermin had been killed and eaten, and the famished mob began eating

grass, moss, old shoes, whitewash, and the corpses found in the streets every morning. If those corpses got buried during the day, the starving Anabaptists dug them up at night to make gruesome meals out of them. Hoping to limit the number of mouths he had to feed, Jan allowed some women and children to leave the city in April. Made wary by Hille Feicken's attempt to murder the bishop, the bishop's troops refused to let the women and children through their lines, and so they continued to starve to death in the no-man's land between the camps, eating grass and the occasional crust of bread the besieging troops' camp followers would throw them: "women and children . . . lingered on for five long weeks in the no-man's land before the town walls begging the mercenaries to kill them, crawling about and eating grass like animals and dying in such numbers that the ground was littered with corpses."[77]

Kerssenbroick described the famine in gruesome detail. Starving women made stews out of the bones and arteries of corpses, and those who consumed these deadly meals contracted horrible diseases, their bodies covered with horrible boils. Some, he continued,

> who drank contaminated water had their bellies swell up to such an extent that they were no longer able to carry that enormously heavy burden. Many helpless children starved to death in their cradles or in their mother's wombs, and many others (I shudder when I put pen to paper to describe such things) were murdered by their parents and eaten. Their dismembered body parts were found after the conquest of the city in several places preserved in brine for future consumption.[78]

Kerssenbroick remembered the plight of the women in Jerusalem when the Temple was destroyed. The Anabaptists' reference to Muenster as the New Jerusalem was an irony not lost on Kerssenbroick, because "this Westphalian city was in every respect like the Jewish Jerusalem, except for the fact that it far exceeded that city in its misery and the sorrow of its circumstances. Of that I have not the least doubt. So it was not without significance that this city was rightly called the New Jerusalem."[79]

Invoking Christ's admonition that God could change stones into bread if he wanted to, the starving inhabitants of Muenster bit into stones hoping He would do just that. Then in the stillness that followed when the stones remained stones, the Anabaptists bewailed their immense misery and their even greater foolishness. Oh Death, the people cried out, why do you keep your distance from us? To which Kerssenbroick responds, "O you horrible spawn of Jerusalem! O you plague of the Jewish People."[80] The Anabaptists in Muenster were identical in Kerssenbroick's mind with the Jews who rejected Christ's tearful warnings about Jerusalem's impending doom. Since the judaizing Anabaptists had turned away from the Church that Christ founded as his kingdom on earth, they suffered a similar fate in the New Jerusalem.

To distract the haggard and starving zombies of Muenster from grim reality, King Jan commanded them to participate in fantastically conceived diversions to continue his domination over them. Bokelzoon staged blasphemous and obscene parodies of the Mass. He ordered the starving population to take part in three days of dancing, footraces, and gymnastics. And then there were the public executions, which some must have envied as a quick end to their miseries. Else Drier was dragged before Knipperdolling's tribunal accused of prostitution. When she denounced him as a regular customer, he flew into a rage and decapitated her with his own sword. After Claes Northorn was caught trying to pass a letter to the bishop, he was tortured, then executed, then his corpse was cut up into 12 pieces and nailed to the city's gates. His head was placed on a pike on the cathedral as a warning to anyone who might want to write to the bishop. As if that weren't punishment enough, Gresbeck adds that his heart and liver "were eaten by a Hollander."[81]

We have no record of King Jan cutting off the heads of prostitutes with whom he consorted; instead, King Jan cut of the head of Elizabeth Wandscheer, his tenth wife. Elizabeth Hardwick, as she was then known, had been brought before Jan for judgment after she refused to have sex with the old man assigned to her as a husband. "There's not a man in this town that can tame me," she said when brought before King Jan.[82] Intrigued by her defiant spirit, Jan proposed marriage on the spot. Elizabeth was King Jan's second favorite wife, after Matthy's widow, but by May the siege and famine had taken their toll on her spirit. After experiencing his lust first hand and eating well with him while famine raged throughout town, she now viewed Bokelzoon as an inhuman monster and wanted to leave Muenster. Enraged that one of his wives could reject him, King Jan had Elizabeth dragged into the Market Square and condemned her to death, pronouncing the following verdict: "She was a whore and always inclined to rebellion. Therefore, Our Father in Heaven commanded me to get rid of her."[83] Then in the presence of his other wives, whom he urged to sing "Glory to God in the Highest," he chopped off her head with his sword, "and kicked her dead corpse with his foot."[84] A contemporary etching portrays him and his wives dancing around Elizabeth's headless corpse in the Market Place. "Those who contradict his judgments soon lose their heads," wrote the anonymous author of one of the *Newe Zeitungen* which reported on the event. "If a wife is angry with another one or quarrels with her, they have [already] lost their heads. . . . The king personally cut off the head of his housewife since she wanted to join other women, who were leaving the city. And he ordered his other housewives, thirteen that is, to watch."[85]

Distracted by famine and demoralized at the beheadings, no one noticed as six men slipped out of the city on the evening of Sunday, May 23. One, Heinrich Gresbeck, was a former Anabaptist now having second thoughts. Another, Johan Nagel, a diminutive but hot-tempered fellow who went by

the name Jack in the Corner or Hansel Eck, had been a double agent from his entry into the city a few months earlier ostensibly as a refugee from unjust charges. They carried with them the secret of the city's demise, the location of an unguarded door near one of the city's gates. It was protected by a moat easily fordable by a portable bridge.

The setting sun was not visible on the evening on June 22, 1534. It was obscured by heavy clouds which dumped large amounts of rain and hail the size of bird eggs on the town, even though it was the summer solstice. The water in the moat must have been cold when Gresbeck plunged into it to drag the first section of a 20-foot long bridge across the moat to the secret door. Soldiers soon crossed the bridge and slit the throats of the first guards they came across. They then proceeded to the cathedral, which the Anabaptists had turned into their arsenal, to wrest it from its famine weakened defenders and then open the city's gates to allow the main force of the bishop's troops under Ulrich von Dhaun into the city.

Before Wilhelm Steding, the leader of the *avant garde*, could secure the cathedral or send a group to open the gate, the Anabaptists sounded the alarm and launched a furious counter-attack, driving the bishop's men from the cathedral into a precarious position in the streets. Forced to find his way through a strange city in the dead of night, Steding led his 400 men into a blind alley, where they were harassed by the arrows of King Jan's soldiers and furniture and bricks dropped on them by women in the neighboring houses. King Jan appeared and demanded their unconditional surrender. If King Jan had pressed the issue, he probably could have annihilated Steding and his cowering troops. Instead he entered into negotiations, which were still going on when the sun came up to reveal one of Steding's men waving a flag near the Jodefeld Gate. Von Dhaun's troops then poured into the city and began a fearful slaughter of the Anabaptists.

The Anabaptists had constructed 16 war wagons which they planned to use, as Zizka had at Kutna Hora, as primitive tanks to break through the bishop's siege. The city's blacksmiths had constructed armor from iron plates to shield the wagons and their wheels from attack. They had also armed each wagon with a small cannon and six to eight "*Hackenbuchse*," a primitive version of what the Soviets during World War II called the Stalin Organ, a stack of musket barrels which could be fired more or less simultaneously with devastating results at short range. The war wagons were never used because the horses to pull them had been eaten, but they were now turned into a formidable fortress in the center of town, behind which Henry Krechting and 200 men defied von Dhaun. Feeling an assault would be too costly, von Dhaun's lieutenant Johann von Raesfeld gave Krechting and his men safe conduct to leave the city. Krechting and 25 men made good use of the opportunity. The others, who returned to their homes to retrieve wives and property, were cut down by the bishop's troops.

The bishop's mercenaries received on the average 16 guilders or roughly $800 for their pains. Sensing that all of their combined boredom and terror would not yield its promised financial reward, the mercenaries vented their anger on the helpless population. "The murder," one contemporary wrote, "was too terrible to describe."[86] Hermann Tilbeck, the former mayor whose treachery helped cause Muenster's woes, was found cowering in an outhouse, where the bishop's troops dispatched him, running him through with their swords and then giving him, in Kerssenbroick's words, a burial fit for a donkey by dumping him in the cloaca. King Jan's "dukes" faired no better. Henry Sanctus, a coppersmith King Jan had dubbed Prince of Mainz, was captured and then beheaded in front of the City Hall. Tavernkeeper Evart Riemenschneider, host of so many momentous theological discussions, was found hiding on the roof of his establishment with the former nun he had married and two other wives. They were executed along with his son. King Jan was captured alive running toward the Agidii Gate. Bernard Rothmann, King Jan's theologian and propaganda minister, wore a white robe at the height of the siege, sword in hand, his side pierced by a sword, but he then disappeared, showing up neither among the living or the dead after the siege.

Bernard Knipperdolling escaped the initial slaughter by hiding with a number of his wives on the roof of a house, but thirst and one of the captured women's desire to avoid punishment led to his capture. When von Dhaun offered the Anabaptist women the opportunity to recant, most accepted and were allowed to return to their native villages. Divara, former nun, former wife of the Elijah from Leyden and former Queen, as well as one of King Jan's 16 wives, did not recant. She was beheaded in the square in front of the cathedral.

On June 29, 1535, Bishop Franz von Waldeck entered Muenster in triumph through the Agidii Gate where King Jan had sought escape, in a coach drawn by six white horses at the head of three companies of soldiers. Von Dhaun presented the bishop with the keys of the city and Wilhelm Steding, who led the attack on the night of June 22, presented the bishop with the insignia of King Jan's messianic kingdom, including the globe symbolizing the world he intended to rule, pierced by the two swords, which were now back in the firm grasp of the lords spiritual and temporal.

Shortly after taking possession of the tarnished Jewel of Westphalia, von Waldeck visited Bokelzoon in prison. The interrogation had uncanny parallels with Pilate's interrogation of Jesus. "Are you a king?" von Waldeck asked. Bokelzoon, lacking the dignity of Christ, responded "And are you a bishop?"[87] When the bishop complained about all of the money the siege had cost, Bokelzoon suggested a way the bishop might recoup his losses. "Let an iron cage be built," Jan said. "Put me in it along with Knipperdolling, and send us out on the road throughout all of Germany. Charge everyone a penny to take a look at us. You'll earn more money than you spent in our war."[88] The

story, which first appeared in an early *Newe Zeitungen* account of the siege, may be apocryphal. If so, it was based on the most famous artifact to survive the violent, short-lived Anabaptist commune in Muenster, namely, the three cages, which as of the summer of 2004, when this author saw them, were still hanging from the steeple of the St. Lambert's Church in Muenster.

A team of Inquisitors, led by Antonius Corvinus, a Lutheran theologian, interrogated Bokelzoon after his capture. Corvinus convinced him of the errors of Anabaptism by appealing to the example of the sun. Just as Jan's blindness would not keep the sun from shining, so it is "with the works and ordinances of God, especially the sacraments." Baptism dispensed grace *ex opere operata*. Corvinus had less success in dealing with polygyny. "Why should we be denied what was permitted to the patriarchs in the Old Testament?"[89] Bokelzoon said; "What we have always held is this: he who wanted only one wife was never to be forced to have more than one. But we felt that a man who wanted more than one wife should be free to do so because he was obeying God's command to be fruitful and multiply."[90] Bokelzoon was consoled by the certainty "we cannot be damned for doing what the fathers were permitted to do. I prefer to be with them and not you."[91] Corvinus, in typically Lutheran fashion, ended the interview by concluding, "We prefer to be obedient to the state."[92] During this interrogation, Bokelzoon said he accepted the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith alone. However, he seems to have died a Catholic. Unlike Krechting and Knipperdolling, who remained impenitent, Bokelzoon accepted the ministrations of Johan von Siburg, the bishop's priest, who found him "greatly changed" on his last night on earth. Von Siburg later claimed Bokelzoon "greatly regretted his godlessness, his murder, his looting, his lack of discipline, and his shameful deeds. He admitted that he deserved the bitterest possible death ten times over, and he renounced all his errors."[93]

On January 22, after lengthy interrogation by theologians and princes, Jan Bokelzoon, Bernard Knipperdolling, and Henry Krechting had their flesh pulled off their bones by red hot tongs for one hour. The insurrectionists were then stabbed in the heart and beheaded. Then their bodies were placed in the three already mentioned cages and hung from the Lambertuskirche steeple, where birds ate what was left of them. Their bones were removed decades later, but the cages remained as a warning to future insurrectionists. When the church was damaged by allied bombers on November 18, 1944, the cages were damaged, but after the war they were repaired and put back. They remained there through the revolution of '68, when Anabaptism gained new cachet through its connection to student revolt and feminism. They remained there during the era of political correctness, in spite of letters to the editor that claimed they were "unbelievably tasteless"[94] reminders of a barbaric past.

Although Jan Bokelzoon played the most spectacular role in the Anabaptist drama in Muenster, the bishop considered him a less important figure than Knipperdolling, but Knipperdolling refused to answer any of the bishop's

questions implicating him in a wider conspiracy. Bokelzoon evaded the same line of questioning by overwhelming his inquisitors with details from his life. No matter how interesting the effect his mother's seduction and his illegitimate birth had on King Jan's subsequent psychological development, it did little to help the bishop uncover any wider conspiracy and thereby prevent the same thing from breaking out elsewhere.

There was, however, evidence that Knipperdolling and Bokelzoon had not acted alone. As late at May 1535 an Anabaptist insurrection broke out in Amsterdam. In June 1534, Bokelzoon and Knipperdolling received an overture from Juergen Wullenwever of Luebeck, who offered to orchestrate an attack on the bishop's troops to help the Anabaptists break out of the siege. Wullenwever "later admitted that he had an understanding with various Anabaptist" groups in Holland; "if he and his followers succeeded in Luebeck, his partners in the other northern cities would introduce Anabaptism there as well and would deal with the magistrates as Wullenwever had done in Luebeck."[95] Had Muenster linked up with Luebeck, they could have united with rebels in Amsterdam, Deventer, Delft, Groningen, Leyden, Wesel and Kleve and might have placed the entire north German part of the Holy Roman Empire under Anabaptist rule.

There were even Anabaptist cells in Cologne, the Rhenish citadel of Catholic orthodoxy. During the 1520s, the Cologne Dominicans under Jacob Hoogstraten, who had championed Pfefferkorn in his battle against Reuchlin, tried with limited success to keep the "poison" of Lutheranism from infecting the principalities of the Lower Rhine. The Cologne city council, however, proved more tolerant than vigilant. The rise of Anabaptist communism in Muenster, only 100 miles away, changed that. Reacting to directives from Charles V in 1533, Cologne burned its first Anabaptist heretic at the stake in August of that year. "On 27 February 1534," Haude writes, "the day the Anabaptist leaders forced everyone in Muenster to be baptized or else leave the city, Cologne's council ordered its police officers (*Gewaltrichter*) to apprehend and imprison all Anabaptists and Lutherans."[96] Fearing a repetition of Muenster, the Cologne city council banned secret religious discussion and any gatherings for that purpose. Less than six months after issuing the ban, the Cologne city fathers learned to their consternation that their city had its own Anabaptist cell under the leadership of Professor Gerhard Westerburg, otherwise known as the notorious "Dr. Purgatory" because of pamphlets he had written against that popish doctrine. Westerburg had traveled to the Wesphalian New Jerusalem in January to receive re-baptism at the hands of Heinrich Roll. He then returned to Cologne to establish a cell which spread its message to Moers, Aachen, Frankfurt, Gladbach and as far as Strasbourg, on the upper Rhein. On 31 October 1534, when the police arrested three Anabaptists, the council learned about the congregation and Westerburg's instrumental role in it. By this time Westerburg had left Cologne.

Under the guise of religion, these networks spread revolutionary ideas far and wide. Lurid *Newe Zeitungen* accounts of what was happening in Muenster served as an inadvertent manual of revolutionary praxis. Bokelzoon became a comic book hero, not unlike Superman. He was a tailor who knew how to confer with princes. He was good looking. His clothes and accessories were impeccable, and in the summer of 1534 he seemed to be a military genius too. He set an example for the "*Poebel*," the German word of contempt for the common man. The specter of *Demos* drawing inspiration from the tailor king caused Philip of Hesse to break out in a cold sweat, because he understood "if the common man saw how effortlessly he was able to depose councilors, take their belongings and act willfully against all honor, law and truth, he would continue to act as he did in Muenster."[97] Philip had been personally involved in the defeat of the peasants in 1525. Now ten years later, Philip was fighting what seemed a much stronger foe, which had conquered one of the most important cities of the north German empire and which was threatening to spread that rebellion to the Netherlands, Flanders and who knew where else. A network linking the Muensterites to Anabaptists in other German lands was trying to replicate itself in other places, even in Hesse itself. These suspicions increased after the collapse of Muenster, because before then the evil had a specific location. Now it seemed to be everywhere. The devil had been loosed. Urbanus Rhegius "saw the devil's footprints all over Muenster."[98] He was not an apprentice devil, said Rhegius, but "the devil of a thousand arts" using the Anabaptists to attack "scripture, Christ, and Christianity and all faith" to "become the lord in Westphalia over body, soul and goods."[99] Corvinus called the events in Muenster "*ein Affenspiel*," largely because the devil aped God. Despite all his wives, King Jan produced no offspring, another sign that he was the devil incarnate. In Muenster, the Anabaptists had turned "everything upside down" to destroy it; they converted "marriage into prostitution, a tailor into a king." Corvinus was convinced the world the Anabaptists "had created was an inversion of the real world, just as carnival season is a reversal of ordinary laws of reason and social order."[100] The more conventional word for a world turned upside down is revolution.

At the Council of Neuss in 1540, Herman, bishop of Cologne, and John, Duke of Cleves-Juelich, learned the confessions extracted from prophets captured after the fall of Muenster indicated Anabaptist agents had been sent "to make the people rebellious" and then "to destroy all existing secular and ecclesiastical authorities."[101] In 1536, the Hessians passed a law against Anabaptism, which averred "Heresy always involves insurrection and destruction of all good customs and morals (*Sitten*); it is preceded by the disruption of government, as is now the case with the Anabaptists . . . as the horrible example of the miserable city of Muenster has demonstrated more than enough."[102] The Hessians had good reason to feel this way, because Anabaptists flooded into their territory following the collapse of the Muenster

commune in 1535. Their new leader was Jan van Batenburg who, in 1537, arrived in Strasbourg to enlist the help of Hoffmann's followers in the Germanies of the south. With their help, Batenburg planned to conquer an as yet unnamed city in Holland and establish another New Jerusalem there.

Batenburg's plans for Holland must have confirmed Herman's and John's fears because they knew Brussels was in contact with Muenster during the height of the rebellion. After Graes turned spy, he reported to Bishop von Waldeck that the Anabaptists had allies in many cities in the Low Countries. Graes also reported that "six men were sent out from Muenster, one to Strasbourg, his name is Johan van Geel, from the little village Geel in the bishopric of Utrecht; one to Frisia, he is a grocer. . . . [those sent to] Holland Wesel were from Frisia . . . They were supposed to start an uprising in the aforementioned cities and countries" by disseminating Rothmann's book *Von der Rache*. "A thousand books of three quartos have been sent from Muenster to the surrounding cities and villages to incite the common people so that Muenster may be freed."[103]

Anabaptist activity was still evident a generation after the fall of Muenster. In 1567, a cobbler, Jan Willemsen, set up another New Jerusalem in the area between Wesel and Kleve, about 60 miles west of Muenster. Willemsen declared himself the messiah and proclaimed communality of wives and property. He and his followers claimed all property was to be held in common and was to be handed over to them whenever their marauding band showed up at a farm or convent. Over the next 12 years, Jan the messiah accumulated 21 wives and a bad reputation among the local princes, who caught him and burned him at the stake in 1580.

Anabaptism still survives in a far less virulent form among the rural communities of the Mennonites and the Amish in the New World, in places like Indiana and Pennsylvania, but also as Schwenkfelders, Hutterites, Baptists, and Quakers.

Cohn relates the story of Willemsen to close the story of the millennial fever he described as coming into the world with the emergence of Emico of Leiningen at the time of the first crusade. If Cohn is truly describing "revolutionary [fanaticisms], aiming to shatter and renew the world," though, the story was far from over, which he makes clear when he writes that "militant revolutionary chiliasm—the tense expectation of a final, decisive struggle in which a world tyranny will be overthrown by a 'chosen people' and through which the world will be renewed and history brought to its consummation. . . did not disappear with the fall of the New Jerusalem at Muenster."[104] The history of "revolutionary movements" which promised a terrestrial and collective salvation," was just beginning.

The rejection of what Cohn terms "the one authority which was universal, embracing with its prescriptions and demands the lives of all individuals,"[105] namely, the Catholic Church, was to have far-reaching consequences which

had yet to play out. Instead of finding their joy in heaven, the "rootless masses of the poor" were now told "the heavenly city" was going "to appear on this earth, and its joys" were "to crown not the peregrinations of individual souls but the epic exploits of a 'chosen people.'" They were told that political movements would lead to heaven on earth. The only institution to consistently tell them otherwise was the Catholic Church: "By canalizing the emotional energies of the laity, by directing their yearnings firmly towards an after-life in another world, the church did indeed do much to impede the spread of revolutionary chiliasm."[106] Conversely, to the extent that the Church was removed from public life, revolutionary messianic political movements moved in to fill the void. Either way, the antinomies were clear and would remain the same for centuries to come: the Church which told men to store up their treasure in heaven and her revolutionary simulacrum, which claimed it could achieve here on earth all that the Church promised.

Chapter Eleven

John Dee, Magic and the Transformation of England

In July 1554, twenty years after the Anabaptist crisis in Muenster, Philip II, King of Spain, married Mary, daughter of Catherine of Aragon and Henry VIII, and became ruler of England too. The leaders of Church and State in Europe certainly hoped the marriage might heal the rift Henry VIII caused when he broke with Rome and alienated Church property. But those hopes were hedged with caveats. Pope Julius III and Reginald Cardinal Pole were adamant that Church lands be restored to the Church.

However, the emperor, Charles V, felt the marriage would smooth all in its wake (especially after the arrival of an heir), and conveyed his opinion to his son Philip, who dutifully and, it could be argued, mistakenly followed his advice. Mary ruled a land where the main issue, the break with the Church and the subsequent theft of Church property, remained unresolved. The thieves had a significant portion of England's wealth, and they were determined to use it to prevent Catholic restoration.

The revolutionaries in England were no ragtag cohort of bakers and tailors, as in Anabaptist Muenster. Anabaptism had disappeared as a significant movement, replaced by something more systematic and insidious, the ideology of Calvin and his police state in Geneva. The revolutionaries in England were not about to take off their clothes and run naked in the streets as had the Anabaptists. The English revolutionaries were a network of families grown so powerful from confiscation of Church property that their names are still known today.

Thomas Cromwell grew enormously rich by plundering monasteries. Cromwell then turned to usury to get even more. He understood his desires were incompatible with the Catholic faith, so Cromwell dedicated his life and fortune to preventing Catholic restoration. He instilled these same beliefs in his family. His nephew married the daughter of a usurer from Genoa; together they became the grandparents of Oliver Cromwell, the Puritan general whose hatred for the Catholic faith the Irish experienced at Drogheda a century later. Thomas Cromwell was determined to "lead Henry by gradual steps to a position from which he could not retreat, to terrorize all political opposition

by a reign of blood, and to set up a wall of material interest against both the Church and the ancient nobility he and his friends wished to supplant."[1]

Cromwell and his famous great-grandson, Thomas Gresham, the author of Gresham's law, were architects of the new England. Together with the Cecils and the Russells, Gresham helped make England the model for the modern nation. England would turn finance into a weapon more powerful than Philip's armies. Revolution in Muenster meant communism; in England it meant capitalism. As Marx understood, the beginning of capitalism was the theft of Church property. The former wealth of the Church was put in the service of Mammon when the wealthy English families contested the Jewish monopoly on usury. Gresham was a financial genius who understood the possibilities for financial exploitation at the dawn of the capitalist age. As Elizabeth's finance minister, he knew how to debase the nation's currency in the interests of governmental policy and those who ran the government, to the detriment of the majority of the nation's citizens, who slipped farther into poverty. Gresham also knew how to precipitate financial crises among his enemies. Under Gresham's guidance England created the wretched proletariat for which it became infamous through Dickens' novels. Under Gresham's leadership:

> A whole class of decent Englishmen, of whom too little has been remembered in history, was swept off the church lands and doomed to poverty, vagabondage and often crime: mostly small farmers and farm laborers with their families, dispossessed because the new owners found it more profitable to raise sheep.[2]

Finance wasn't the only new weapon Philip had to face. According to the mother of Philip's new wife, Henry VIII had been turned into the dupe of his own lusts by a cabal that knew how to manipulate his sexual passions as effectively as Gresham knew how to manipulate prices. Long before the pope refused to grant Henry a divorce from Catherine of Aragon, the same group that would profit from the plundering of the monasteries was using the King's infatuation with Anne Boleyn to bring him under their control. "My plea," Catherine wrote, "is not against the King my Lord, but against the inventors and abettors of this cause."[3]

> These are my real enemies who wage such constant war against me; some of them that the bad counsel they gave the King should not become public, though they have been already well paid for it, and others that they may rob and plunder as much as they can. . . . These are the people from whom spring the threats and bravado proffered against Your Holiness; they are the sole inventors of them, not the King, my Lord. It is, therefore, urgent that Your Holiness put a very strong bit in their mouths.[4]

Catherine seemed aware that the sexual spell Anne Boleyn exerted over her husband could be put to political use. Boleyn was educated in Navarre at the court of Marguerite d'Angoulême, "the most corrupt and anti-Catholic court in southern Europe."[5] Marguerite's Dominican spiritual advisor, Gerard Roussel (whom Walsh claims was of Jewish origin) hurried to Germany in 1521 to imbibe the new evangelical freedom at its source as Luther wrestled with his vow of celibacy. Out of that unsuccessful struggle, Luther's doctrine of the enslaved will would emerge, a doctrine that enabled Luther to marry; many monks and priests followed his example. Cranmer, who had his Lutheran wife smuggled into England in a crate, was part of this network, which had grown tired of living under the sexual prescriptions of the Catholic Church.

Many thought the Church's financial proscriptions equally onerous. The desire to profit from usury was a great incentive to join the revolutionary struggle against the Church's hegemony over European culture. The rudimentary alliance between capitalism and revolution first became apparent in England when the families grown rich with the spoils of the church lands adopted Calvin, not Muentzer, as their theological mentor. In economic matters they took as their mentors the Jews, who had been expelled officially from England in 1290. Expulsions usually meant that the principled Jews left, leaving behind the unprincipled majority (only 16,000 Jews left England in 1290) to pursue their former way of living unhindered under the mask of Christianity. These marranos provided a natural network and support system for other Jews who returned secretly to England over the next few centuries under the guise of Spanish, Portuguese, or Italian merchants. The Lombards, who practiced usury on Lombard Street in London, were probably crypto-Jews. As in Spain, many English Jews went underground to preserve their fortunes. When Jews expelled from Spain in 1492 joined them, the time was ripe for expansion of Jewish influence over English culture under the guise of the reformed faith.

Many have noted this change in English culture and the subsequent rise of Britain as the philosemitic nation. Barbara Tuchman noticed that "England changed" during the 16th century even though she "cannot fix upon the exact date... when the god of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob became the English God."[6] She believes the main reason "the heroes of the Old Testament replaced the Catholic saints"[7] was Tyndale's translation of the Bible, smuggled into England in 1526 in false bottom wine casks transported by Sephardic Jewish merchants. Tyndale's translation, says Tuchman, influenced England even until the Balfour Agreement establishing the Jewish presence in Palestine in the early twentieth-century:

> With the translation of the bible into English and its adoption as the highest authority for an autonomous English church, the history, traditions and moral law of the Hebrew nation became part of the

> English culture; became for a period of three centuries the most powerful single influence on that culture. It linked, to repeat Matthew Arnold's phrase, "the genius and history of us English to the genius and history of the Hebrew people."[8] This is far from saying that it made England a Judeaophile nation, but "without the background of the English bible it is doubtful that the Balfour Declaration would ever have been issued in the name of the British government or the Mandate for Palestine undertaken, even given the strategic factors that late came into play."[9]

Tuchman writes as if the Old Testament were unknown in England until the first half of the 16th century, a patent absurdity. Jacques Maritain's comment is more perceptive. Whenever the Bible is ripped out of context, "revolutionary ferment of extraordinary violence"[10] erupts. Once the Church is removed as the arbiter of Scripture—once Scripture was no longer read according to what Augustine called "the spirit"—it gets read, as Augustine warned, according to "the flesh," the way the Jews read it, as a prescription for establishing heaven on earth and, ultimately, a front for appetite. The Gospel becomes "carnal" when separated from the Church; it becomes a justification for violations of chastity or of the prohibition against usury. It becomes, as Nietzsche claimed, a front for the will to power.

This judaizing tendency reached its full flower when Thomas Cromwell's great-great-grandson became dictator in England. As Tuchman says, "With the Puritans came an invasion of Hebraism transmitted though the Old Testament."[11] Tuchman adverts to the notion that Scripture is a front for appetite, saying the Puritans "followed the letter of the Old Testament for the very reason that they saw their own faces reflected in it."[12] But she takes the idea no further. Puritanism meant the end of Christian morality and the importation of "Jewish habits." According to Cunningham, as cited by Tuchman, "The general tendency of Puritanism was to discard Christian morality and to substitute Jewish habits in its stead."[13] The natural consequence was "retrogression to a lower type of social morality which showed itself at home and abroad."[14] The first manifestation of that moral retrogression was the widespread poverty characteristic of English life for centuries thereafter.

"By mid-16th century," Tuchman concludes, "it was possible to talk about a revolution, an international political movement bent on overthrowing the medieval view of the world and replacing it with something new."[15] In England, that "something new" was the rationalization of greed, appetite, and *libido dominandi* later known as capitalism. Whenever that age referred to its new system of economic exploitation, it used the vocabulary of a bygone era. And so it referred to the dawn of a new age of mammon and usury, and to the rise to power of revolutionaries well-off from the theft of Church property and bent on imitating the Jews in theology and economics. None of these advances in finance could have been accomplished without the willing collaboration of the Jews. Like the Jews, the thieving English

families supported "the forces of heresy in religion and liberalism in politics."[16] That meant usury, a system Lord Bacon would defend explicitly in an essay on economics. England became Jewish not because it read the Bible, but because the leading families promoted widespread distribution of heretical translations, which everyone had the right to interpret, as a front for usury and their consolidation of political power. Freedom meant the right of the powerful to determine what was true. Everyone was free to interpret the Bible as he saw fit. When that interpretation did not correspond to the interests of the powerful, *force majeure* would become the ultimate explicator.

When the ecclesial bond uniting England and Rome was severed, the bond uniting Englishmen was fatally weakened too, because once England stopped being Catholic it became an ideological nation favoring aliens who supported the new regime over the natives who opposed it, but also over those who simply didn't understand what was happening. The recusant and the clueless were swept away by the same tide. The Protestant was the alien *par excellence*. His secret allegiance was to the shadowy conspiracy emanating from Geneva, not to his native country. Not surprisingly, many of these aliens were Jews, either crypto-Jews like Marco Perez, using the facade of Calvinism in Antwerp to cover his identity as a revolutionary, or descendants of Jews expelled from Spain.

If on the issue of the restoration of Church property, Mary found no support from her husband, who, swayed by his father to oppose the pope and Cardinal Pole, had left the country immediately after the marriage anyway. She found even less support among her dubious advisors. Prominent among them was chief commissioner John Russell, progenitor of a family wealthy from looting the Churches that would equal the Cecils in influence. John Russell came from a family of wine merchants who traced their ancestry to the Roussels of Gascony, who traced their lineage to wine-trading Jews from Spain or Portugal. With a husband *in absentia* and advisers like Russell, the issue of Church property soon became moot. During the reign of Edward, Mary's predecessor from 1547 to 1553, "the loot went on at an appalling rate. When [Edward] died and Mary came to the throne, it was nearly completed. A mass of new families had arisen, wealthy out of all proportion to anything which the older England had known, and bound by a common interest to the older families which had joined in the grab."[17] Those families included "the Howards. . . the Cavendishes, the Cecils, the Russells, and fifty other new families" whose fortunes were based upon "the ruins of religion."[18] The monastic lands stolen by these families constituted one fifth of the wealth of the country. "[T]his transference had tipped the scale entirely in their favor as against the peasantry,"[19] who sank into a poverty from which they never recovered, only to emerge as an equally impoverished proletariat in the industrial revolution. By 1660, the king was a "salaried puppet"[20] in the hands of the magnates, while more than half of the population had been

"dispossessed of capital and land. Not one man in two, even if you reckon the very small owners, inhabited a house of which he was the secure possessor, or tilled land from which he could not be turned off."[21]

The loot remained in the hands of the looters, who would use it to prevent re-establishment of the Church and economic policies inimical to usury, which they wanted to expand into a system of governance. Thwarted on the economic front, Mary tried to deal with the Protestant revolutionaries solely on theological grounds, an attempt doomed to fail. Unsurprisingly, Mary, the scion of the line that brought the Inquisition to Spain and saved it from internal subversion, brought the Inquisition to England to address the secret cabal that enabled Henry VIII to cast off her mother for the Lutheran sex agent Anne Boleyn. Philip, who left for the continent shortly after the wedding (he was to return briefly in March 1557 and stay until July 1557) concurred with Mary's decision even though he was seldom there to implement it.

Mary began to burn heretics in 1555 in a campaign that the magnates condoned to foster popular hatred for the regime. Mary learned the hard way that times had changed. It was no longer 1480, and England was not Spain. The enemies of the Church had grown much more sophisticated in psychological warfare. So Mary's enemies paid for ballads ridiculing her phantom pregnancy while she tried to get a handle on her evanescent foes.

In the five years of Mary's reign, 300 Englishmen died at the hands of her Inquisition. John Foxe, in exile in Switzerland, termed Mary's victims "martyrs." Protestant historians have expressed doubts about their piety. "The real truth about these 'Martyrs,'" according to Protestant historian Cobbett, "is that they were generally a set of most wicked wretches, who sought to destroy the Queen and her government, and under the pretence of conscience and superior piety, to obtain the means of again preying upon the people. No mild means could reclaim them."[22]

Bishop Edmund Bonner of London was one of Mary's lieutenants in her crusade against Protestant influence. Foxe devoted a couplet to Bonner, the bloody bishop of London:

> this cannibal in three years space three hundred martyrs slew
> They were his food, he loved so blood, he spared none he knew

On May 28, 1555, a warrant was issued for the arrest of a secret Protestant cell with direct links to Elizabeth, Mary's half sister, and the next in line to the throne. Elizabeth was brought to Hampton Court for questioning. One of the conspirators named was a young scholar, John Dee, on the staff of Bishop Bonner, working as his assistant in ferreting out and punishing secret Protestant heretics.

John Dee was born on July 13, 1527, the same year Kerssenbroick saw fiery signs in the sky, presaging the end of the old order. There is no information on his place of birth, whether he was baptized and where, or any details about his

family. Dee would come to fame as Queen Elizabeth's conjurer and astrologer, and the time of birth, aligned with the position of the stars, was essential in casting a person's horoscope. "In those dark times," the 17th century historian John Aubrey wrote, "astrologer, mathematician and conjurer were accounted the same things."[23]

Dee grew up in England under the shadow of Henry VIII's divorce and the country's looming break with Rome. Frances Yates called him the characteristic philosopher of his age. More than Tyndale's translation of the Bible, Dee is responsible for turning England into *the* judaizing nation *par excellence*: Dee created the philosophy that allowed England's new rulers to integrate their lust for gain, their judaizing, their imperialism, and their penchant for magic into a more or less coherent whole. His enemies accused him of casting spells. He did a horoscope of the royal wedding between Mary and Philip, and informants later claimed that, in casting that horoscope, Dee had "endeavored by enchantments to destroy Queen Mary."[24] His role ranged from casting horoscopes to assigning propitious dates for momentous occasions, for example, Elizabeth's coronation, to advising on matters geographical and political. By the time of his death in 1608, the tide of reaction was running against him, but by then he had left an indelible mark on what would become the world's premier Protestant empire and foremost promoter of revolution.

While a student at Cambridge in 1546, Dee put on a performance of Aristophanes' play *Peace*, during which a mechanical scarab beetle leapt off the stage in flight to the palace of Zeus. No one could explain how Dee accomplished this. Shortly after his *coup de theatre*, Dee left for the continent on the first of many trips to the centers of learning there. Dee went to Louvain, a center of what he called "the intertraffique of the mind"[25] in the Spanish Netherlands. The Low Countries were the delta of the continent's largest river, and analogously, all currents of thought, including the new revolutionary ideas, ended up there as well. The Anabaptists had gravitated toward the Low Countries after expulsion from Thuringia and Westphalia, and with them flowed the ideas of radical Protestantism, along with Renaissance science from Italy, navigational discoveries from Portugal, and Cabala, in a millennialist redaction that tried to make sense of the expulsion of the Jews from Spain. Louvain was a home to all of these ideas, and Dee imbibed deeply. While there, Dee noted in his diary the arrival of the heir apparent, Philip of Spain, who would loom large in his career.

Dee's religious views at the time are unclear. Since he later was employed by Bishop Bonner, he probably was a Catholic, but Dee seemed equally at home intellectually in reformist England during the reign of the sickly child King Edward. In 1568 Dr., later Cardinal, William Allen, soon famous as the leader of England's exiled Catholics, warned students under his care at the new Catholic college at Douay in the Netherlands to keep their distance from "Ioannes Deus," whom he described as "*sacerdos uxoratus, magicis curiosisque*

artibus deditus."[26] Was Dee a married priest practicing magic and uncanny arts? A member of the Walsingham intelligence community claimed Dee was ordained while in Bonner's service. If so, his ordination did not recommend him to Cardinal Allen, who suspected him of trafficking in spirits and double-dealing. Dee was, according to Allen, a purveyor of "certain irreligious influences,"[27] more dangerous because of his cover as a Catholic priest.

Dee's biographer tries to resolve the religious issue by claiming, "Throughout his life, Dee refused to commit himself to a particular religion."[28] The same cannot be said of his politics. Dee was at home under Protestant and Catholic regimes because he believed in neither Protestantism nor Catholicism. He believed in an alternative to both, what Yates called "the occult philosophy in the Elizabethan age."[29] The clearest expression of his beliefs came later with publication of his *Monas Hieroglyphica*. The Monad was his symbol for the key to understanding the universe. It was intimately related to the language God spoke when he loosed the divine force that caused the universe to come into existence and then stay in orderly motion. Magic, as Dee understood it, involved "the human ability to tap this force. The better our understanding of the way it drives the universe, the more powerful the magic becomes. In other words, magic is technology."[30] Neither Protestant nor Catholic, Dee believed in magic, and he was willing to work with whichever regime was willing to pay for his services. Since the Catholics considered him a magus who trafficked in unclean spirits, that meant that Dee would work for the new Protestant establishment in England, which was avid to put his discoveries to political use.

Magic determined his politics, which determined his religion. In 1552 Dee returned to find England had changed in his absence. "Everywhere statues were destroyed in the churches," Dee wrote in the diary he kept to the detriment of his reputation. "The great crucifix. . . on the altar of St. Paul's was a few days ago cast down by force of instruments, several men being wounded in the process and one killed. . . . There is not a single crucifix now remaining in the other churches."[31]

Seeking some explanation, Dee sought out John Cheke, his former colleague at Cambridge. Cheke introduced Dee to his son-in-law, William Cecil, who in collaboration with Elizabeth, who knighted him as Lord Burghley, would become an architect of the anti-Catholic revolution during the latter part of the 16th century. Burghley presented Dee to the court of Edward in 1552 and, under his auspices, Dee joined the household of Northumberland later that year.

When Mary died in 1558, Cecil probably rescued Dee from his exposed and precarious position as Inquisitor, because it was through Cecil that Dee had become an Inquisitor. Once Mary died, anyone associated with her regime was in jeopardy, most certainly someone like John Dee, Bloody Bonner's chaplain. Foxe's account of Bonner's persecutions bears this out. In

the first edition of *Acts and Monuments*, Dee's involvement in the persecution is documented in detail. His name then disappears from the 1576 edition, although his words do not. Everything Dee said as Inquisitor is still in the book but, as Woolley puts it, "every occurrence of his name (more than ten) has been deleted or substituted with the anonymous label 'a Doctor.'"[32] The reason is clear. Foxe learned Dee "was up to something," while ostensibly in Bonner's service, which made clear Dee was no "Catholic colluder."[33] Dee was a double agent. Claiming to be a Catholic in Bonner's service, Dee was really working for Cecil and Elizabeth and the cell identified in the arrest warrant of May 1555. Dee landed on his feet because he was working secretly for the new regime all along. In contemporary parlance, Dee was an "intelligencer." Dee was "a seeker of hidden knowledge, philosophical, scientific, as well as political."[34] As proof of his standing with the new regime, Dee chose the date of the Queen's coronation, which he set after consulting the stars and the time of her birth.

EMPEROR CHARLES V AND THE HIDDEN JEWS

On October 25, 1555, roughly six months after Dee was arrested, Charles V abdicated as emperor. The abdication was complicated, and it lasted well into 1566. Charles was 55 but seemed much older, worn down by his vices and by shadowboxing with forces out to destroy him but which he had difficulty identifying. His advice to Philip on England was misguided and would cause his son much heartache. They did not realize the sinister nature of the changes in England; both were taken in by lies Elizabeth and her ministers spread about their intentions, deferring action until it was too late.

Charles came to the throne in 1516 when his grandfather Ferdinand died. In 1496, the Jews were expelled from Portugal as part of a marriage agreement to unite the King of Portugal with the daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella. Those who refused to convert moved north, importantly to the Spanish Netherlands, where they soon made use of their skills at international trade. As early as 1512, large numbers of Sephardic Jews settled in Antwerp, "whose citizens," Nadler says, "perceived the financial advantage of admitting these well-connected merchants."[35]

In 1516 when Ferdinand died, Charles was living in the Spanish Netherlands as the Jews arrived in large numbers. Luther would nail his 95 theses to the church door in Wittenberg one year later. Within the next half-century, Antwerp would become a center of international intrigue involving Sephardic Jews, English Protestants, and German Anabaptists, culminating in the Iconoclast rebellion of 1566. By then, the Reformation was in full swing. As Charles was to discover, Spain solved its Jewish problem by exporting it to the north. One of the tenets of the Black Legend is that Spain went into decline following the expulsion of Jews. To the contrary, "the Spanish Empire

attained its greatest limits and material and intellectual power in the century after the Expulsion."[36] But the problem showed up elsewhere. Many Jews remained unbelievers, even if they professed the faith to save their wealth, and "their descendants were in communication with *Jews scattered all over Europe*, building up new commercial empires, especially in the Low Countries and in England."[37] These Jews functioned as a sophisticated spy network that "quietly kept the anti-Spanish and anti-Catholic forces of the world informed as to naval, military, and commercial happenings in the peninsula. Thus the Jews, in the long run, took their revenge on the country that had cast them out. In this sense only can it be said truthfully that the exodus led to the decline of Spain."[38] Kamen claims one consequence of the expulsion was the creation of "an international Jewish conspiracy":

> Several Spaniards later regretted the expulsion of Jewish financiers in 1492; in the seventeenth century Spanish writers first claimed the growing wealth of countries like Holland was due to converso capital flowing into Amsterdam. Later, the mythical decline of Spain and the triumph of its enemies were blamed on the international Jewish conspiracy. Among the first to take this line was the poet Francisco de Quevedo, who claimed Jewish elders from all over Europe had held a meeting at Salonika, where they drew up secret plans against Christendom. Quevedo and others accused the count duke of Olivares of planning to invite the Jews back into Spain to undo all the consequences of 1492.[39]

What went underground in Spain came into the open in the German principalities and the Low Countries. In Spain, heresy took on a quietist tinge and became "Illuminism" of the sort practiced by the Gnostics and the Albigensians centuries earlier. "Catholic Jews of slight orthodoxy" collaborated with Protestants of the German-speaking north in their campaign against the Church. They offered Charles V 800,000 ducats if be would make certain "reforms" in the procedure of the Holy Office. "Charles," according to Walsh, "seemed unaware, most of his life, that he was surrounded by the agents of an international conspiracy to destroy everything that his heart loved and revered."[40]

By 1540 the converso issue was over in Spain. Spain had saved itself by importing the Inquisition from southern France, and then by exporting its problem to the north of Europe. For some indication of what might have happened in Spain if the situation there had gone unchecked, we need only look at Poland. Jewish influence over Polish political life increased in intensity, fueling Polish imperialism in the East while weakening Polish rule at home. Graetz brags that a Jew in Constantinople chose the successor of Sigismund Augustus in 1572. Polish laws codified Jewish hegemony over large areas of Polish cultural life. Since disobedience to the predations of the Jewish tax-farmers was a capital crime in Poland, animosity against the Jews was

widespread but severely repressed. An explosion of violence was all but certain. The explosion came when the Sejm, dominated by the Polish magnates and their Jewish administrators, rebuffed Cossack aspirations for political reform in 1647. Cultural drift in Poland led to an explosion of the sort the Inquisition prevented in Spain. As a result, the Polish republic went into terminal decline, expiring 147 years later.

The Jewish settlements in the newly-Protestant regions of the North drew marranos like a magnet. Disaffected Catholics who had lived double lives as clerics now made common cause with the Jews who had led double lives after converting to Catholicism to preserve their wealth. A coordinated attack on the cultural hegemony of the Catholic Church proceeded when these groups came together. Revolution was a binary weapon, a Protestant-Jewish alliance from its inception. The Jews, as Newman shows, promoted every "reform" movement in Europe, from the Hussites to the Anabaptists, to weaken the hegemony of the Catholic Church, reasoning that the enemy of their enemy was their friend. In places like Antwerp and Amsterdam, the Jews put their wealth and their considerable expertise in finance and publishing at the disposal of the Dutch Calvinists and their princely protectors to wage cultural warfare against the Catholic Church and Spain, its defender. Liberation from the stress of a double life was intoxicating, and the intensity of the intoxication demonstrates the stress it exerted on those troubled souls. An orgy of "gluttony, drunkenness and lasciviousness" followed this "liberation of the northern man from the trammels of Roman culture."[41] In the wake of this Reformation, a Venetian ambassador reported, "among the Germans, overeating was considered a virtue, and cupidity, among the Calvinists especially, was a synonym for superior industry; and that when a German was sober, he was thought to be ill."[42]

Lured by the promise of wealth from the conjunction of river and sea trade in Antwerp, Portuguese conversos settled there as early as 1512, when the Netherlands were still under Hapsburg control. Charles V, the Holy Roman Emperor, was under tremendous political challenges and had little time to figure out what was going on, much less how to stop it. Ratifying a *fait accompli*, in 1537 Charles V gave the expelled conversos permission to settle in the Spanish Netherlands as long as they did not revert to Judaism or Judaize.

Many of those Jews settled at Antwerp, a natural entrepot on the northern bank of the Scheldt River with easy access to the North Sea. Because of its location at the mouth of the Rhine delta, Antwerp was the link between European markets and the colonies European countries were establishing throughout the world. Antwerp soon became the richest city in Europe, "where merchants and usurers lived in palaces with regal pomp and luxury." It was

> "the center of that commercial system which was soon to be superseded by a large international life. . . a stately and egotistical city" which was then the centre of the Jewish money power, driven from Spain three quarters of a century before. Along the river were massive warehouses, stuffed with treasures from the ends of the earth.[43]

Antwerp became the center for trade in East Indian spices and Brazilian sugar, and the agents for these firms were almost without exception Portuguese conversos. Indeed, the wealthy trading firms were almost exclusively Portuguese new Christians. In less than a generation, the Jews made Antwerp the center of world trade and finance. The Jewish merchant who came and went as a "Lombard," a "Genoese," and an "Italian," or more commonly a "Portuguese" had found a new earthly paradise. His new-found freedom allowed him to re-establish the Jewish commercial supremacy of the Middle Ages. Because of the expulsion of the Jews from Spain, Antwerp became the center of a large mercantile network that included Jewish communities in Lyons, Ferrara, Rome, Turin, Venice, and Ancona and extended to Ragusa, Salonika, and Constantinople, and south to Suez and Cairo, the line of the overland trade to the Indies. That mercantile network doubled as a spy ring.[44]

The Jews who controlled the spice trade reinvested their profits in the new printing trade, which they quickly used for cultural subversion and psychological warfare by printing Protestant Bibles. The printing business combined with the intelligence network gave the Jews and Protestants a significant advantage in the war with Spain. Soon the Jews were smuggling Protestant Bibles into England, making a handsome profit from cultural subversion.

By the end of the 16th century many conversos had moved to Amsterdam, then under Calvinist control, where they threw off the appearances of Christianity and formed their own Jewish communities. Beginning around 1603, the marranos in Holland emerged as Jews. The confessor of Philip II's sister Maria, Fray Vicente de Rocamoro, disappeared suddenly only to re-emerge in the Jewish community in Amsterdam as Isaac of Rocamoro. The new Jews of Amsterdam had peculiarly Catholic devotions to figures like the Old Testament figure "Saint Esther," but Catholicism disappeared gradually from their culture, replaced by the emerging Protestant revolutionary view.

In 1540 Charles received disconcerting news that the marranos in Antwerp were engaged in a propaganda war against the Catholic Church. The marranos had a disconcerting affinity for Protestantism and, unlike Luther, kept that affinity a secret in times of danger. Charles was surrounded by men, including clergy, who had secretly gone over to the other side. "[S]ecret Jews wound themselves into the confidence of Charles and his very family, and sapped the foundations of the Faith he loved under cover of some of the new fashionable opinions from the north; the new Jewish communities at various strategic

points in Europe were quietly building up greater empires of economic and political strength to oppose and to plague him and his successors."[45]

Two years later, the Austrian branch of the Hapsburg family banished all Jews from Bohemia after they were discovered passing military intelligence to the Turks. The Jewish refugees then moved to Poland and Turkey. In 1545, Charles learned that marranos from Spain and Portugal were involved in secret arms shipments to Turkey for use against Christians. Four years later, Charles expelled the marranos from Antwerp. Many Jews remained as Catholics, while others became Protestants and migrated to England, where they continued in the ongoing insurgency against Spain and the Catholic Church. Sandoval found in Jews a perennial racially based inclination toward "ingratitude" and subversion. The racial interpretation of Judaism that arose in Spain was given new life by the marranos of the Netherlands, whose evil tendencies were like "the inseparable accident of blackness"[46] among Negroes. "The slightest provocation," Sandoval continued, tended to "pervert the Marranos" into reverting to Judaism, making them "extremely dangerous in communities."[47]

Despite expelling the Jews from Antwerp, Charles was at a loss deciding how to deal with so subtle an enemy. Perhaps passion clouded Charles' judgment. According to Walsh, "If the Emperor had put on the strong armor of sanctity which the Church, his wife and his conscience had often urged upon him the result might have been different, but a Charles dallying with lusty Barbara Blomberg between fits of the gout and spurts of gluttony was no match for the Jews."[48]

Charles also failed to deal with the Protestants effectively. One of his greatest regrets as he lay dying was that he did not execute Luther as a heretic and traitor during the Diet of Worms. That the damage done by the Protestant revolt during his reign was limited, was not due to his ineffectual efforts to stop it, but the internal fragmentation and dissension in the movement.

Writing in 1564, the year Calvin died, and 18 years after Luther's death, an English Catholic apologist described tongue-in-cheek, the many alternatives to Catholicism:

> Now, so ye be no papist, ye may be a Sacramentary, an Anabaptist, or a Lutheran; and then a Civil, a Zealous or a Disordered Lutheran, among all which ye may choose of what sort in each branch ye list to be; whether ye allow two sacraments with the zealous Lutherans, three with the Leipsians or four with the Wittenbergers; whether ye will be an Osiandrin, a half-Osiandrin or an Antiosiandrin; whether a close Anabaptist or an open Anabaptist, a new Pelagian or a new Manichee. Whether ye say the body is with the bread, or the bread without the body, or pledge to assure the body, or the very value and effect of the body. All

> these with a number of other doctrines professed and defended freely of Protestants hath God now revealed for truths, faiths and gospels to recompense the darkness of nine hundred years.[49]

The half-humorous irony bespoke the confidence of the Catholic cause in the wake of the Council of Trent; it derived nothing from the befuddlement of an emperor grown old before his time and too worn out by his vices to carry on the task God had ordained for him. Nonetheless, the year of Charles' abdication saw a dramatic reversal of fortune for Catholicism. Philip II, his son, would never bear the title emperor, but as the King of Spain, he carried on the struggle for the Catholic faith that his father should have fought. His name became synonymous with the Counter Reformation, especially its military application. Beyond that, the papacy went through rebirth and revitalization, the likes of which had not happened before. The change in papal character from a Renaissance Epicurean like Alexander VI to an ascetic like Pius V was dramatic.

CALVIN LEADS THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT

In August 1559, Pius IV was elected pope. He reconvened the Council of Trent, reassembling the church's bishops to answer the challenges of the reformers and provide a program of reform. Beginning with the election of Paul IV in 1555, the popes, strengthened by the doctrinal clarity and the ecclesial reform that Trent enabled, exercised their office in a way unheard of for decades if not centuries. By the time Pius IV became pope, the Peace of Augsburg, which tried to resolve the Protestant split in the Germanies with the formula, "*cujus regio ejus religio*," was not working. Europe needed a thoroughgoing reform, better theological clarifications, and political resolution. The Protestants were determined to press their political advantage despite the doctrinal splintering that plagued them.

When the Council of Trent reconvened in January 1561, the English bishops weren't there, because Elizabeth would not allow the papal delegates announcing the council to set foot on English soil. But 113 other church fathers were, and when they finished their deliberations on December 4, 1563, the church tied up over 17 years of loose ends, providing successive church leaders with a blueprint that would be remarkably successful in reversing much of the damage wrought over the past half century. By the time the council was over, "simony, pluralities, nonresidence, ignorance, and racketeering" were no longer synonymous with church administration.[50] Pius IV took a knife to his own household, firing 400 hangers-on in what O'Connell terms "radical surgery."[51] The operation was a success, largely because of the people who implemented the council's teachings. Pius V succeeded Pius IV in 1566, and a series of equally remarkable popes followed Pius V, all united in implementing the same program. Ignatius of Loyola, one of the Church's great

organizational geniuses, died in 1556, one year into Paul IV's reign. Ignatius did not found his order to fight Protestants, but his followers like Edmund Campion in England and Peter Canisius in the Germanies adopted that role with remarkable success. Once equilibrium was reestablished in Europe, the Jesuits turned to the colonies of Spain and France in the New World, where their zeal was crowned with similar success. When the Counter Reformation had run its course, Protestantism was on the defensive, and the Church was run according to a new canon of organizational principles. Before 1555 the cardinals controlled the pope; after 1598 the pope controlled the cardinals as the Church centralized its power to deal with the centralization of the newly emerging modern state.

Lutheranism, which was either blessed or rendered ineffective (depending on your point of view) by Luther's innate conservatism in matters not of burning personal concern, became, as Thomas Muentzer predicted, a docile tool of small German principalities; it was in no position to lead an international revolutionary movement, especially one that required close collaboration with the Jews. On May 5, 1527, Lutheran German mercenaries sacked Rome, and the Jews took it as a sign that the messiah, a handsome Marrano named Solomon Molkho, was on his way to redeem them. In 1530 the Lutherans, under Philip Melanchthon, showed revulsion at this Jewish presumption and the complicity of the Judaizers, when they issued the Augsburg Confession, which condemned millennialism and the belief in the rule of the saints on this earth, a doctrine promoted by Anabaptists then and Calvinists later. Melanchthon and Luther were deeply offended by Molkho's apocalyptic tone and condemned the Christian version of his ideas as a Jewish doctrine. Molkho was burned at the stake in Italy in 1532. In 1542 Luther expanded his attack on the Jews by writing an intemperate invective that has caused Lutheran theologians intense embarrassment ever since. The defection of Luther and Melanchthon from the revolutionary cause left the field open to the Calvinists in Geneva, but before they could assume the mantle, they had internal issues to resolve.

The accusation that Protestants were Jews was not new. Calvin claimed an opponent "called me a Jew, because I maintain the rigor of the law intact."[52] Others claimed the Genevan reliance on "*jure gladii*," the law of the sword, to suppress dissent made Calvin "a Jew." Calvin was a lawyer before he became a reformer; his reliance on the law to micromanage the minutiae of everyday life reminded many of Jewish proscriptions in Deuteronomy and Numbers. His notion that idolatry should be uprooted by military force was consistent with the Anabaptist reading of the Old Testament. His approach was a more refined, more sophisticated, and more legalistic appropriation of the Old Testament than the version that had inspired the Anabaptists in Muenster and the Taborites in Bohemia. The idea Calvin was a Jew or he was working for the Jews was, therefore, not new or far-fetched.

The evidence that Protestantism was Jjdaizing was there for all to see. Graetz and Newman agree the Jews played an important role in the Protestant revolt. Walsh quotes Cabrera, a Spanish Marrano, who claims "most of the heresiarchs and heretics of this present century have been of those people," i.e., the Jews. "It is beyond question," he continues, citing another Jewish historian, that "the first leaders of the Protestant sects were called semi-Judaei, or half-Jews, in all parts of Europe," and "men of Jewish descent were as conspicuous among them as they had been among the Gnostics and would later be among the communists."[53]

Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin were all students of Nicholas of Lyra, a Franciscan monk of Jewish descent who lived in the 14th century. Nicholas got his ideas from Raschi, who was the conduit that allowed the Talmudic scholarship of his father, Isaac of Troyes, to flow directly into Protestantism. Reuchlin was another conduit. When Pfefferkorn accused Reuchlin of being in the pay of the Jews to disseminate their propaganda, the essential truth of the charge caused Reuchlin to issue a violent denial in his pamphlet *Augenspiegel.* Reuchlin's battle with the Cologne Dominicans was the diversion that allowed Luther to issue his 95 theses with impunity. In each instance, Protestantism exhibited not an advance over Catholic thought, but "one long retrogression toward the moribund Judaism of the Pharisees of the time of Christ."[54]

Conversos waiting impatiently to throw off the pretext of Catholicism were in communication with the Jews throughout Europe and together they formed the nucleus for the coming international revolt. Their skill in finance and printing made them powerful culture warriors who could influence events in ways their opponents had difficulty understanding, and they were quick to put these skills in the service of messianic political movements. The constant in Jewish participation in revolution from Simon bar Kokhba to Trotsky was not race but rejection of Christ. Revolution was a theological project from its inception:

> It was their great tragedy that, having failed to understand Who Christ was, [the Jews] could not get rid of the messianic consciousness for which they had been chosen and consecrated. Finding closed to them the only spiritual door to salvation, they were constantly driven to seek redemption in the here and now, in the resources of matter, in gold and power, in anything, anywhere but Christ. When all their kingdom had turned to dust in their patient hands, and the inevitable scourge of persecution came to scatter them again and again, they still followed leaders who kept them blind, and remained missionaries of what Saint John called "the spirit that dissolves Christ."[55]

Many of the Jews expelled from Spain and Portugal fled to cities in France. Many more made their way to the Spanish Netherlands, where Charles allowed them to flourish. Lucien Wolf claims large numbers of English Protestants—

"and doubtless the most active in propaganda and organization"[56]—were Jews who had become Calvinists in Antwerp where they were active in the Protestant movement and "had given up their mask of Catholicism for a not less hollow pretense of Calvinism."[57] There was a natural affinity between the Calvinists and the Jews. Both were "enemies of Rome, Spain and the Inquisition."[58] And Calvinism was a form of Christianity similar to Judaism in its attitude toward idolatry and the law. As a result, the Jews "became zealous and valuable allies of the Calvinists."

There is no indication that Calvin or his lieutenant Beza were of Jewish descent, but many of their preachers were. Calvin was hardly as flamboyant as Bokelzoon in playing the Old Testament prophet, but he was as willing to have his followers use the sword as any latter day Gideon, even if he didn't wield it himself. In a letter to his English followers, he said anyone who refused to give up the Catholic faith must be put to the sword. Because of his legalism, his lack of charisma, and his willingness to create a systematic framework for his thought, Calvinism became an international movement that soon eclipsed less intellectually powerful rivals like Anabaptism as the *avant garde* of the revolutionary movement. Calvin tried to distance himself from the Jews, but he nevertheless relied on them as his intellectual inspiration and co-revolutionaries, especially as spies. Neither his police state in Geneva nor the imitation of it erected in England could have prospered without the Jewish intelligence ring in the spice trade in the Netherlands.

The embarrassment Molkho caused in Protestant circles would be palpable for quite some time. In 1530, Oecolampadius accused Michael Servetus, the Unitarian Spanish physician who discovered circulation of the blood before Harvey, of Judaizing. Louis Newman says "The career of Michael Servetus. . . affords a vivid instance of the imprint of so-called 'Jewish influence' upon the Reform movements of the Christian Church. . . . Jewish friends and his study of Jewish literature. . . served to create both the atmosphere and the special background wherefrom the revolutionary doctrinal system of Servetus emerged."[59] Newman dismisses race as an influence on Servetus' conversion to a Unitarianism indistinguishable from Judaism, but there is no evidence he was a Marrano. Judaizing was a matter of intellect and will, not some involuntary biological reaction. "The 'Judaizing' tendencies in individuals such as Servetus, and in movements such as the Puritan, the Unitarian and others, by no means depended upon deeply hidden traces of Jewish blood-heritage."[60] Servetus was corrupted by contact with Marrano teachers from whom he learned Hebrew and medical lore, including what they knew about blood. "It is beyond all reasonable doubt," says Newman, that Servetus "derived his unusual Hebrew knowledge and perhaps also his advanced medical lore from marranos in the Spanish Peninsula."[61] After finding the Jews right on medical matters, Servetus concluded they were right on the Trinity. "We are surely justified in assuming that his vigorous anti-Trinitarian

views," Newman continues, "were also absorbed from these Jewish teachers."[63] The papal nuncio said Servetus was corrupted by unauthorized translations of the Bible distributed by the Jews in Spain "from their headquarters in Antwerp."[63] Newman suggests that in Paris, Servetus saw French translations of Luther's works "written and printed by Jews."[64]

In 1531, Servetus wrote *De Trinitatis Erroribus*, published in Strasbourg, a hotbed of Anabaptism, in which he used the writings of Rabbi David Kimchi to attack the dogma of the Trinity, a move certain to make him unpopular in Catholic and Reformed circles. The threat to the Protestants was significant, because Catholics could now cite Servetus's anti-Trinitarianism as the logical conclusion of the Reformation's judaizing, and they could point to the numerous Hebrew citations in his writings as proof. Servetus was re-baptized at 30, but he soon turned on the Anabaptists too. By the 1550s Servetus was a wanted man, and wanted more by the Protestants than by the Catholics. In 1553 Calvin engineered his arrest at Vienne on charges of heresy. Escaping from prison, Servetus thought of returning to Spain. Perhaps fearing that he might fall into the hands of the Inquisition, Servetus went to Geneva instead, where he fell into the hands of Calvin's police state and was put on trial for heresy. The Calvinists claimed Servetus "had written, published and said that to believe there were three distinct persons: Father, Son and Holy Ghost, in the single essence of God was to forge or feign so many phantoms and to have a God parted into three, like the three-headed Cerberus of the heathen poets."[65] They found him guilty, burning him to death at the stake.

Calvin's resort to the tactics of the Inquisition caused considerable consternation among the Reformed Party. Calvin was not stupid enough to be unaware of the risks, and probably proceeded because the alternative was even more fraught with danger. What was the alternative? To acquiesce in the accusations that the reformed faith was judaizing and that Calvin and his associates were secret Jews? "The central contention of the opponents of Servetus," says Newman, "was that his entire theological system was a vindication of Jews and Judaism."[66] Servetus was to Calvin what Muentzer was to Luther. He was the disciple who carried the master's premise to its logical conclusion, and in so doing, left the new system dangerously exposed to attacks by its enemies. No revolution can succeed without a boundary on its flank, and the only way to create it is by brute physical force, since revolution has no internal order. So Zizka exterminated the Adamites; Luther urged the German princes to slay Muentzer and his peasant followers; and Calvin burned Servetus at the stake. Cromwell would have to deal with the Fifth Monarchy Men, and Stalin would have to deal with Trotsky, but the precedent was established. "When Calvin burned Michael Servetus at Geneva in 1553," Newman writes, "he was trying to burn away the influence exercised by Marrano Judaism on the dogmas of Christianity."[67] He was also trying to maintain control over a movement that naturally tended toward Judaism.

Calvin's critics insisted that "by their strenuous insistence upon the effects of Adams's transgression as compromising mankind at large, and Abraham's readiness to sacrifice his only son," Calvin and his fellow Reformers had "interspersed the religion of Christ with such an amount of Judaism that their Christianity was in many respects a relapse into the bonds of the Law from which Christ had set us free."[68] It was a serious charge; Servetus paid for Calvin's answer with his life. Calvin dealt with the Jewish issue by burning Servetus at the stake, stopping the mouth of those who called him a judaizer, while incorporating Jewish principles into his system and baptizing them as Calvinism. By time of its founder's death in 1564, Calvinism had replaced Anabaptism as the cutting edge of Protestant revolutionary thought. By the time the Catholic Church aroused itself from the decadent indolence of the Renaissance, Anabaptism was gone and "the enemy it encountered everywhere wore the face of John Calvin."[69] Calvinism became the intellectual leadership of the revolutionary movement because, as Marvin O'Connell says, "In Geneva reformation went hand in had with revolution."[70] Calvin rescued the revolution "when the Protestant reform was wavering on the brink of anarchy."[71]

Calvin's lieutenant Beza tried to convert the King of France to Calvinism in 1561, and the Dutch descendants of Jan Bokelzoon turned to Calvinism when Anabaptism became the god that failed in Muenster. By the time of Charles V's abdication, Calvinism led the revolutionary movement, and the focus of its activity was the Spanish Netherlands.

QUEEN ELIZABETH TAKES THE REINS AND RELEASES HER HOUNDS

Once Elizabeth was crowned on January 16, 1559, Cecil lost no time in putting his plan to cut England off from Rome into effect. The first act of Parliament under the new regime abolished the spiritual jurisdiction and authority of the pope in England. The Act of Supremacy was the first in a line of increasingly draconian penal enactments "to eradicate the Catholic faith from England and to set up Protestantism in its place."[72] The same Parliament then abolished the Mass, making it a criminal offense to say or hear it. Taken together, the two acts were "tantamount to doing away with the Catholic religion in England."

The first ideological state followed. To be a good Englishman, Elizabeth's subjects had to affirm by oath that all spiritual jurisdiction was vested in the Queen, "who thus became supreme governor in all spiritual and ecclesiastical things and causes as in temporal."[73] The Good Englishman also had to attend the new worship or suffer onerous fines. Those who refused were known as recusants or refusers, and some paid the price of martyrdom. England became known as "perfidious Albion" because of the religious hypocrisy of its leaders: "They were ashamed to admit to Catholic sovereigns abroad that

they were cruel persecutors of Catholics at home and so they tried to rob their victims of the martyr's crown by pretending that they died as traitors."[74] Like Hamlet in Denmark, the recusants learned what it was like to live under a "rotten" regime which would not admit its intentions or its origins honestly and which punished those who did by deeming them traitors. "They were traitors to the godless state," Knox wrote, "because they would not be traitors to Almighty God. . . . Thus it was that the new religion was forced upon a reluctant people."[75] This time the English bishops did not go along, and they were replaced by a motley assembly of political opportunists, who then replaced the loyal Catholic clergy with hacks, pothecaries, and dawbers who outdid the most venal of their medieval predecessors in seeing religion as an avenue for financial gain.

Gradually, fanatical Calvinists like Francis Walsingham created a regime of mammon in England that was naturally philosemitic. On the theoretical level, this philosemitism found expression in the system known as capitalism. On the practical level, Walsingham collaborated with the international Jewish spy ring that complemented his domestic intelligence efforts. Together they would form a new, formidable weapon to thwart the Counter Reformation on the continent.

Cecil's anti-Catholic legislation made apparent the error of Charles and Philip's policy toward the magnates. Elizabeth was a tool of Cecil, who, along with the other magnates, was determined to hold on to the loot stolen from the Church. If Mary had immediately returned the monastery lands to their rightful owners, and if she had had an heir, things might have turned out differently. But Cecil and his gang of looters, emboldened by the inactivity of Charles and Philip, pressed their advantage as the powers behind the throne. By his opportunism, Philip had allowed the emergence of a regime "which would become the rallying point of the new Protestant world. . . and plague him to the day of his death."[76]

Cautiously at first, the Protestant exiles returned to offer their services to Cecil. Francis Walsingham returned from exile in Switzerland and became Cecil's spymaster. In 1559, John Knox returned to Scotland and, collaborating with Cecil, turned Scotland into an English fief by buying off the nobility by bribing them with stolen Church lands. Once the lairds were assured they could appropriate the revenues accruing from monasteries and bishoprics, they "turned a movement into a revolution by solemnly proclaiming themselves Lords of the Congregation and protectors of the Protestant Kirk."[77] As a result, the Catholic Faith was banished from Scotland, attending Mass became a capital crime, and Mary, Queen of Scots, great-granddaughter of Henry VIII and next in line to the English throne, became a prisoner in her own country. In 1559 it looked as if all Europe might follow Germany's example and become Protestant. Scandinavia and Switzerland had thrown off the Catholic yoke. England had done the same. There was no reason to believe the rest of Europe

would not follow. Emboldened, Cecil became less fearful of antagonizing Philip. When the King of Spain complained about English pirates preying on his Flemish subjects, Cecil refused to make restitution, thus encouraging the pirates. With Philip outwitted, the time seemed ripe for a bold initiative.

So Cecil inaugurated England's new foreign policy by proposing Elizabeth as the head of the anti-Catholic crusade. Referring to Cecil, O'Connell says, "Many of [Elizabeth's] closest advisers would have had her mount a Protestant crusade. . . but the queen took a decided worldly view of the dangerous world she lived in. . . . The advantage to be pressed was English not Protestant."[78] With the Act of Supremacy, however, there was no difference between being English and Protestant. Elizabeth and Cecil had alienated the Church of England from Rome and intended to put the country in the service of the Protestant cause. To be a good Englishman, one had to be a Protestant. Anyone else was a second-class citizen and, if Catholic, a traitor fit to be hanged. Foreign policy would serve the Protestant cause, which would be bound up with an English nationalism unknown in the middle ages. Together, they would form the nucleus of British imperialism for centuries. Shortly after coming to the throne, Elizabeth

> sent emissaries to the kings of Denmark and Sweden, the princes of Germany and the rulers of Switzerland "and all States alienated from the Catholic Church," proposing a league "not only for the defense of their religion but for its propagation and to so much for the security of their own affairs as to cause trouble and detriment to the Crown of France." To dispose men's minds to this effect she sent four English preachers, four Germans and one Frenchman, from England to Germany, who, feigning to be moved by religious zeal and ardor, went to visit many cities and princes, sometimes themselves preaching what they thought might most facilitate their object, and sometimes making the local preachers perform the office.[79]

According to the cardinal of Lorraine writing to the Venetian ambassador to France, the plot originated in Geneva. On July 13, 1559 the day of Henry II's death, Throckmorton wrote Cecil claiming the moment had come to move against France and take back Calais, even though France and Spain were at peace. Cecil felt the new order in England was a model for Europe; the time was right to press the advantage of the "invisible kingdom of opposition,"[80] a "link of mysterious cooperation between enemies of the Catholic Church, who raised such formidable obstacles, all over the world, to King Philip II."

Shortly after Elizabeth's coronation in 1559, John Dee "performed a disappearing act."[81] Little is known about his activity during the next five years except that he went abroad, and while abroad, learned to read Hebrew. Woolley claims he "taught himself Hebrew"[82] to become involved in a new field of research, the Cabala, from which he would learn the secrets of the

universe. But Dee probably did not teach himself Hebrew. If he possessed such formidable linguistic ability, he could have stayed home. He went abroad to learn Hebrew and begin his study of the Cabala. Like Reuchlin before him, he learned Hebrew at the feet of the rabbis. Learning Hebrew any other way is unlikely. No one studied Hebrew at the university, because no one taught it there. Dee could not learn Hebrew at the feet of rabbis in England, but as he probably learned in the Netherlands in the 1540s, he could do it there among the Jews newly emigrated from Spain and Portugal. He probably wanted to learn Hebrew because he wanted to learn Cabala so he could practice magic. "The chief practitioners of magic and astrology were Jews,"[83] and the people most likely to pay Dee for his occult knowledge were militant Protestants like "William Cecil and Lady Elizabeth" and "lukewarm and questionable Catholics [such] as Catherine de Medici and her weakling sons, all of them infected with heresy."[84]

CABALA OFFERS ENGLAND A NEW PHILOSOPHY AND A NEW RELIGION

The link between supply and demand is significant because we have to assume that Dee went not on his own to the continent but as an agent of the Cecil regime. Dee became an agent of the Cecil/Elizabeth faction at the time of Queen Mary, and the evidence indicates he remained one for the rest of his life. He was certainly an agent when he went to Prague in 1583. This is not to say he was well-remunerated. None of Walsingham's "intelligencers" was. They were paid according to performance, after the fact, and according to the government's need; Walsingham was particularly stingy, keeping agents dependent on him rather than *vice versa*.

Dee was most probably sent abroad to learn Cabala because both Dee and Cecil considered Cabala the cutting edge of the new science and the new intelligence technology. Unlike Scholasticism, especially the English nominalist variety that had soured Luther, neither Cabala nor the occult science based on it wasted time learning about essences for the sake of truth. As Reuchlin had said over half a century earlier, Cabala delivered tangible results like gold and power.

If Dee, as Yates maintained, truly was the characteristic philosopher of his age, the characteristic philosophy of that age was the *occulta philosophia* that Dee received directly from Reuchlin's student, Cornelius Agrippa. Through Cabala, Dee made a clear break with the Middle Ages. Because he had the support of the government, he was able to redefine England in a fashion that was revolutionary and enduring. In the 1590s, Shakespeare would deal with the changes Dee had wrought, viewing them in both a positive and a negative light. According to the negative view, the occult philosopher was saturnine, which was also characteristic of the Jews; he was melancholy

because of the deep insights the occult philosophy gave him. Hamlet was a dramatic representation of the occult philosopher. Durer's famous etching of Melancholy was a pictorial representation of the same thing. The positive view of the new man—the Renaissance man as the English Magus—shows up in the Midsummer Night's Dream and the Tempest, both of which are suffused with magic. Prospero was, according to Yates, modeled on Dee. His island kingdom was the new occult Protestant England, based on James Strachey's description of Bermuda, an island known on contemporary maps as the "*insula daemonum*."

The Renaissance Man was a Magus, and Cabala made him one. An unfortunate result of the expulsion of the Jews from Spain was the introduction of Cabala into Christian circles. Reuchlin wrote his first book on Cabala in 1492, the year the Jews were expelled. It is obvious, however, that Jews had been in Italy for quite some time, but all of the Jews, whether recently expelled or not, had to come to grips intellectually with the expulsion, and the Lurianic Cabala was one way the Jews dealt with this calamity. Under the influence of the Cabala, Jewish thought became more apocalyptic, more millennialist, and the ferment in Jewish circles soon had an effect on Christians. Jews expelled from Spain brought the Cabala directly to England, initiating, Yates says, "the gradual integration of Jewish influences into European culture."[85] Yates tries to make sense of the anomalies in Dee's thought—Dee was a brilliant mathematician and geographer, but he was also a "conjurer" of angels who believed he was "an ardent reformed Christian"—by calling Dee a "Christian Cabalist" who supported "the 'more powerful' philosophy implicit in Neoplatonism as understood by Pico, Reuchlin, Giorgi, Agrippa and as developed in the Renaissance occult tradition."[86]

"Christian Cabalist" is a synonym, if not a euphemism, for Judaizer, and before long through Dee's redefinition of science the Talmud made its first serious entry into English culture. Cabala, not Tyndale's translation of the Bible, marked the beginning of England as the philosemitic nation. Cabala was the lens through which Dee saw all of the trends the new government was interested in, from usury to "intelligence," thus redefining what the now Protestant country would promote. What it would suppress was already clear: the Mass was gone and with it any connection between the Englishman and Catholic Rome. In its stead, Dee promoted imperialism, magic, usury, and the occult science as state of the art intelligence technology. "Dee is certainly following Agrippa's outline in the *De occulta philosophia* and that was a work founded on Renaissance Magic and Cabala. Also he hints in the Preface at higher secrets which he is not here revealing, probably the secrets of the angel-magic."[87] Dee's Christian Cabala would link the messianic politics of the Hussites and Anabaptists with the cabalistic arcana of Renaissance magic, and out of that marriage England would emerge as the messianic Protestant nation. Its main literary propagandist in the Elizabethan age would be

Edmund Spenser. Following his lead, John Milton would become the literary propagandist for the Puritan age. The common denominator shared by messianic politics and Renaissance magic was Talmudic Judaism, which sank its tenacious tendrils into English soil.

Yates' use of the term "Christian Cabala" is intended to cover a multitude of sins. On the one hand, Christian Cabala is the "'more powerful' philosophy that was to supersede scholasticism, as potentially a world-wide movement of reform, to be applied not only in Elizabethan England"[88] but throughout Europe. In this sense, "Christian Cabala" is a euphemism for judaizing Protestantism. On the other hand, Christian Cabala also means involvement in "good" or "white" magic. Dee insisted, and Yates accepts the claim, that he was only speaking with "good" angels during his conjurings. "A pious Christian Cabalist," Yates writes, "is safe in the knowledge that he is conjuring angels, not demons. This conviction was at the centre of Dee's belief in his angelic guidance, and it explains his pained surprise when alarmed and angry contemporaries persisted in branding him as a wicked conjurer of devils."[89] Dee could make that claim only because Catholicism had been banned from England by the time he began his conjurings. The Catholic position was clear: if a man attempts to summon angels, only fallen angels will respond, and then only if he puts his soul in jeopardy. Christopher Marlowe stated the orthodox position in *Dr. Faustus*, his attack on Dee's cultural hegemony over the "new England" Dee had created. The nuncios took the same position in Prague, when Dee showed up there.

Yates also claims "The sensational angel-summoning side of Dee's activities was intimately related to his real success as a mathematician."[90] This too is false. If Dee was successful as a mathematician, it was despite his involvement in Cabala, for Gematria is to mathematics what astrology is to the study of the universe, which is to say, a false start down a blind alley. Only when Mersenne cleared the intellectual rubbish the Reuchlin-Agrippa-Dee tradition had spread could science and mathematics emerge from the mumbo-jumbo Elizabeth and Cecil promoted as the antidote to Catholicism and Scholasticism. Dee undoubtedly produced wonders for the government agencies who wanted to use his magic "to drive the Prince of Parma from our land,"[91] as Marlowe put it later, but they led nowhere. It was not only Dee (or Giordano Bruno) whom Marlowe had in mind when he has Dr. Faustus say, "Tis Magick, Magick that hath ravish'd me."[92] It was his country as well.

The change in thought in England that Dee promised through Cabala was not unlike what Karl Marx promised 300 years later. Before, men used philosophy to describe the world, but now Dee, as master of Cabala, would change the world through magic. The principle was simple: Hebrew was the language spoken by God himself. It was by the divine word that the world came into being and continued to function. So any man who knew those words could bend the universe to serve his will, just as God could. One technique

was known as Gematria, which involved learning the numerical significance of Hebrew words, each letter of which had a numerical value. Cabala was related to the Pythagorean idea that reality was ultimately number. But another feature of Cabala was its preoccupation with angels. Copernicus' *De Revolutionibus* appeared in 1643, but Dee was still living in a universe in which things were in motion because an intelligent spirit was moving them. The spirits that moved the stars and planets were known as angels. One preoccupation of Cabala was learning the names of angels, as well as figuring out just how many there were (301,655,172, according to one set of calculations). If a man, through magic, could learn their names, he could, like God, command them to do his bidding. According to contemporary thought—thought which Dee accepted completely—the heavenly bodies determined the existence of minerals in the earth. The fact that Mercury was both a planet and an element was just one indication of this correspondence. The moon was silver. The sun corresponded naturally to gold, and so gold was normally found in the tropics, where the sun was strongest. By learning the names of the angels who moved planets like the sun, Dee would become the master of the elements, able to change lead into gold, as well as the master of intelligence, able to send messages (*angelos* meant messenger) back and forth without cipher. Dee would actually come up with a way of using angels as a form of communication. In an age when the King of Spain, England's archenemy, owned the gold mines of the new world, all of this had political and military implications, which is most certainly why Dee went to the continent to learn Talmudic technology and most probably why he went there as Cecil's agent.

There is an obvious connection between magic and prayer: the former is a parody of the latter with supplication replaced by command. When Woolley writes, "incantations would work whether you were a Catholic or Protestant,"[93] he either misses the point of what magic is about or he is tacitly placing Protestants outside the Christian orbit. The point of magic is to do away with man's precarious position as a supplicant and place him in a god-like position of command. Man cannot order angels around, any more than fish can command men, because angels are superior beings. The adept, believed the man who learned Cabala, became superior to angels and ceased to be a mere man. Therein lay the temptation and the danger of magic: seeking superiority to the angels, the magician sank below the beasts because he abandoned what was distinctly human, namely reason, which alone could discern the true order of being.

Although most scholars trace freemasonry's beginnings to the 17th century, Walsh claims "something very like the odor of freemasonry . . . hung about the court of Elizabeth."[94] He traces that odor to Sir Thomas Sackville, modestly famous as the author of one of the first English plays, *Gorbaduc*, first performed 1561. Sackville, according to Walsh, was the Grand Master of the Grand Lodge at York. Suspicious of any secret society in her realm,

especially one that withheld secrets from the world's most formidable police state, Elizabeth sent an armed force to break up its meeting and apprehend its members. Sackville, one step ahead of Elizabeth, placed masons in the troop sent to break up the meeting. Either Elizabeth was taken in by their ruse, or they admitted her to membership in the lodge and shared with her their secrets and arcana. A pattern emerged: the leading Protestants were the leading masons. When the Grand Lodge was divided into two groups upon Sackville's resignation in 1567, Francis Russell, Second Earl of Bedford, became head of the northern Lodge, and the Queen's financier, Sir Thomas Gresham, became Grand Master in the South. The magnates in England all began as Protestants and ended up as masons when the revolutionary spirit leapt like a spark from the Protestants to the masons at the time of the Restoration in 1660.

Many have noted the connection between freemasonry and Talmudic Judaism. The Talmud, with its "scurrilous and vindictive blasphemies against Christ" was "the chief means employed by the Annas and Caiaphas of each age to keep the mass of the Jewish people in ignorance of the true nature of Christianity, and to fan their misunderstanding of it to hatred."[95] The moment Christianity lost the will to contest the Talmud, that doctrine began to occupy the intellectual territory so badly defended by Scholasticism and the Humanists. Once Christians lost the will to contest it, judaizing was a natural consequence; the rise of the Talmud in Christian culture was a function of that loss of will. The inordinate craving for the magic which Cabala dangled before the eyes of credulous Christians became the chief impediment to contesting the Talmud. Why should these books be burned if they contained important information? Cabala was the Jewish version of the Albigenisian importation of Gnostic thought onto European soil. The Talmud and Cabala became the crucial link between the heresies defeated by the first Inquisition in the Middle Ages and freemasonry, which took up the revolutionary banner after Europe tired of sectarian strife in the wake of the Thirty Years War.

The continental tradition differs from the English. A diffuse Gnosticism had, after some time, found a home amongst the Knights Templar. When the King of France suppressed the Knights Templar and brought about the death of Jacques (James) De Molay, it looked as though a tradition had ended. And in the ordinary sense it had. But, as Peter Parker in *The Murdered Magicians* notes, the tradition was to be fancifully resurrected. He points out that: "The transformation of ideas about the Templars during the eighteenth-century shows how far from stern scientific rationalism the men of the Enlightenment could wander. In the very body of Church history which was the prime target for rationalisation and demystification, eighteenth-century men found the Templars, and turned them into a wild fantasy . . ." And there were no greater promoters of this "wild fantasy" than the Freemasons. The histories of gnosticism, Cabala, Talmud, the Protestant revolt and the masonic lodges

were self-consciously (if not historically) intertwined by eighteenth-century men opposed to the Church. Freemasonry was always a messianic political movement, an explicit alternative to Catholicism bound up with the rituals of Judaism and Jewish symbolism. The adept must travel toward the east, toward Jerusalem to find Enlightenment; he is going to rebuild the Temple and he is going to find a lost world.

Sir Francis Bacon felt America was the New Atlantis; the English colonization of that continent was largely the work of John Dee, who felt Baffin Island contained, if not the ten lost tribes of Israel, as Menasseh ben Israel would claim about South America, then a people with Latin books who brewed beer. The earliest Jewish settlers in the New World brought freemasonry with them. When 15 Jewish families arrived in Newport, Rhode Island from Holland, they brought with them the continent's first masonic lodge. "Descendants of certain of these Jews," Walsh writes,

> originally from Spain and Portugal, went into the whaling industry, and founded some of the First New England families. A little later, according to a masonic authority, "American masonry was introduced into China by the captains of the clipper ships, who came out from New England to trade with the Chinese." . . . The official coat of arms of the English Grand Lodge, even to this day, is the one made in 1675 by Rabbi Jacob Jehuda Leon, known as Templo, who went from Holland to England that year. "This coat is entirely composed of Jewish symbols," explains Dr. Lucien Wolf. "It is obviously an attempt to display heraldically the various forms of the Cherubim pictured to us in the second vision of Ezekiel—an Ox, a Man, a Lion, and an Eagle—and thus belongs to the highest and most mystical domain of Hebrew symbolism. . . . If one looks more carefully, it becomes apparent that they have the hindquarters of goats, with hairy haunches and legs and cloven hoofs that tread upon the motto "holiness to the Lord." The trail of masonry always leads to, and crosses, that of the wandering Jew, whether he actually founded it or not.[96]

William of Orange was not a Freemason; he was a Calvinist, and Calvinism was the revolutionary movement in Holland in mid-16th century. But his great grandson William III was a Freemason and a Protestant; because of that, he was brought from Holland to rule over England at the time of the Glorious Revolution. The Jews played an important role in keeping England in the hands of the Protestants. In collaboration with Protestants who brought William from Holland, Isaac Auaso, a Jewish banker from Amsterdam, contributed two million guilden to the effort that kept James II, the legitimate Catholic heir, from returning to the English throne. Occult Protestantism became formalized as freemasonry during the 17th century. "It is quite certain," Rabbi Benamozegh wrote, "Masonic theology is at root nothing else

than Theosophy, and that it corresponds to the theology of the Kabbala."[97] What Walsh calls "nascent freemasonry" is really Dee's "Christian" Cabalism.

THOMAS STAPLETON AND WILLIAM ALLEN

Within months of Dee's disappearance in September 1559, a newly ordained Catholic priest, Thomas Stapleton, set sail for the Spanish Netherlands. Like Dee, his goal was the university at Louvain. Dee traveled to the Low Countries to learn Cabala from the rabbis. But Stapleton left because England was no longer hospitable to men who took the Catholic faith seriously.

Stapleton would become "the most learned Roman Catholic of all his time."[98] Although his works have been little read since his death, they were read aloud when the pope sat down to his meals in the Vatican. Born at Henfield, Sussex in July 1535, days after the execution of St. Thomas More, Stapleton was probably named after More. Stapleton watched Nicholas Ridley and Hugh Latimer burned at the stake for heresy. Since he felt the punishment fit the crime, he probably correctly assumed his prospects as a Catholic priest were not good under the new regime.

So he left England. He probably left illegally, with all the risks that entailed, so firm was his decision. "Fearing the contagion of schism in my tender years," he wrote, "I came a fugitive to the learned benches of Louvain."[99] Just as the Spanish Netherlands were a magnet for Calvinist revolutionaries, so too it attracted many English Catholics because of its proximity to England, and because it was ruled by Philip II, the Catholic King of Spain who had been the English sovereign as well. Shortly before his death, Stapleton described himself as "a true and trusty servant to his Majesty of Spain,"[100] who alone, it seemed to him, stood between Christianity and the abyss. "Louvain," Knox tells us, held a special attraction for the learned Catholics in England,

> because of the convenience which it afforded for writing against the heretics. Nor was it long before they set themselves to work. Treatise followed treatise in defense of the Catholic faith and confutation of Protestant errors. They wrote by preference in English for their object was to address not the learned but the multitudes. The books were printed in Flanders and then smuggled over in large quantities to England: an operation which was not difficult, on account of the continual communication existing between the two countries. As might have been expected, their labors soon bore fruit in confirming waverers and reclaiming many who had fallen away.[101]

In 1561, Stapleton was joined by fellow Oxonian William Allen. If Stapleton was the mind of the exiled recusants, providing intellectual ammunition to explode Protestant positions, then Allen was their will, deploying those weapons as a general and administrator. Allen was, like Stapleton, a priest, but unlike Stapleton, Allen would become a cardinal and the leader of the

exiles in the Low Countries. Allen crossed to Flanders in 1561, and when he arrived at Louvain he found many of his countrymen had preceded him. Allen returned to England a year later and for the next three years he traveled from one beleaguered Catholic community to another "urging upon them the duty of abstaining from all communication with heretics in the Protestant worship by law established."[102] Because Cecil and Elizabeth had avoided the excesses of their continental allies, the Anglican and the Catholic services were confusingly similar. Many English Catholics were confused; even worse, they used the similarities to rationalize what Allen felt were unconscionable compromises. "Many priests," Knox tells us,

> said mass secretly and celebrated the heretical offices and supper in public, thus becoming partakers often on the same day (O horrible impiety!) of the chalice of the Lord and the chalice of devils. And this arose from the false persuasion that it was enough to hold the faith interiorly while obeying the Sovereign in externals.[103]

Allen would have nothing to do with compromises. As a result of his single-mindedness and his preaching, "it was brought about in a very short time that a vast number of our countrymen not only came to hold right views about religion, but abstained altogether from the communion, churches, sermons, books, and all spiritual communication with heretics."[104] Allen's labors bore most fruit in the northern counties, which were still largely Catholic, especially "in the county of Norfolk, in the family of the Duke of Norfolk, who, though himself a Protestant, gave protection to several learned Catholics."[105] His zeal drew the attention of Cecil and Walsingham, and so in 1565, Allen was forced to return to the Low Countries.

The political situation had deteriorated there in his absence. In August 1559, Philip II sailed from Flushing to Spain, appointing as governess in his absence his half sister Margaret, the Duchess of Parma. The great lords of the Netherlands were offended by the slight and withdrew from the government, aiding rising Dutch nationalism and resentment against Spain that the Calvinists, although they too were agents of a foreign power, successfully exploited. William of Orange eventually headed this treacherous faction. A religious opportunist who was by turns Lutheran (the religion of his birth), Catholic, Lutheran again, and finally a Calvinist, William would connive with the Jews and lead armies of foreign mercenaries on repeated fruitless attempts to drive the Spaniards from the Low Countries.

In January 1561 Philip withdrew Spanish troops from Dutch soil. If they had been the source of the problem, the problem would have ended. Instead, Philip's gesture, compelled by lack of money, accelerated the revolution by showing what his enemies considered weakness. In September 1562, English troops occupied Calais, and Elizabeth then used the French port closest to England as a staging area to support the Huguenots, who had embarked upon

a campaign of savage iconoclasm in France. The Protestant rabble took a lesson from their Hussite forbears in their wanton destruction of the sacred and their desecration of the dead. Sacred hosts and the bones of the dead were scattered in the mud in front of desecrated churches and trampled under foot by men and horses. To this organized thuggery and desecration, Elizabeth contributed 6,000 men and 100,000 crowns; the emboldened Huguenots pillaged their way across Normandy to link up with the English forces. On February 18, 1563, Duke Francis of Guise, upon whom English Catholics placed their hopes, was shot; after a week, he died. Under torture, his assailant admitted he acted as an agent of Beza, Calvin's lieutenant, then laboring to convert the king of France, and Admiral Coligny, another Calvinist sympathizer. This was no local uprising based on legitimate complaint, but an international conspiracy involving the highest levels of religion and government attempting to overthrow the Catholic hegemony of Spain and put in its place the revolutionary police state of Geneva. Convinced by his three years in England that no half measures would suffice, Allen went on pilgrimage to Rome to interest the pope in a permanent institutional commitment to bring England back to the Catholic fold.

Called back to England by his father in the same year that Allen returned, Stapleton also was immediately caught in the trammels of the nascent Elizabethan police state when he was subpoenaed to appear before an episcopal tribunal. "I was scarcely home," Stapleton wrote to his father, "when I was called before the mock tribunal of the heretic jester to whom fair Chichester had become subject."[106] Protracted negotiations followed, after which Stapleton professed his willingness to swear to the part of the Oath of Supremacy that testified to the Queen's rights as supreme governor in temporal matters.

By early 1563, Stapleton could see the situation in England was hopeless. The clouds of heresy were not going to blow away on their own. So Stapleton returned to Louvain with his family, never to set foot on English soil again. Instead, he settled in the Low Countries and set his pen to work to drive the illicit Elizabethan regime from England. "At this time," he wrote, "I began to write my first books against the heretics, but in the vernacular tongue only."[107] If the English Catholics had been left to wage their war of words in peace, they might have driven Elizabeth from the throne. The Spanish Netherlands became the headquarters of the recusant Catholic publishing industry, and during the 1560s, those printing presses caused Elizabeth increasing concern. The leaders of the ill-fated Northern Rising were inspired to rebel by the recusant tracts from Louvain. An intellectual foe this formidable did not go unnoticed by Elizabeth's intelligencers, who would not respond with intellectual weapons. The recusant print apostolate was going to be crushed by subversion or by force of arms.

CHRISTIAN RULE UNDER ESPIONAGE

In February 1563, John Dee resurfaced in Antwerp. Dee took up residence at the sign of the Golden Angel. Apparently Dee was drawn to Antwerp because of its publishing industry. The "escalating clatter of printing presses"[108] included the "Officina Plantiniana," one of the world's most important publishing firms, founded by Christopher Plantin. Plantin was famous as a publisher of heretical books, including those of Hendrick Nichlaes, founder of a secret society known as the Family of Love. The familists invited "all lovers of truth. . . of what nation and religion soever, they be—Christians, Jews, Mahomites or Turks and heathen"[109] to join an organization a lot like the symposia Reuchlin described in his books or what was to become the Freemasons. Dee was most probably a fellow traveler. Dee was a bibliophile who haunted bookstores in England and on the continent, striking up conversations with other customers as a way to find rare books or gather intelligence.

Dee was especially interested in finding an extremely rare unfinished book by Johannes Trithemius known as the *Steganographia*. Trithemius' interest in Cabala drew the charge he was a magus, "trafficking in demons."[110] "I hoped," Carolus Bovillus wrote after meeting Trithemius, "that I would enjoy a pleasing visit with a philosopher, but I discovered him to be a magician."[111] Trithemius' work was unfinished at his death in 1516, but its fame spread nevertheless. Dee was more intrigued by Trithemius' reputation as a magician than repelled by it. Imagine then Dee's excitement when he heard a copy was available for inspection, if not purchase, in Antwerp.

The *Steganographia* brought together two of Dee's interests: angels and what later came to be known as encryption technology. In *Steganographia*, Trithemius proposed using angels as God did, as messengers. Trithemius's encryption system was simple. Volumes I and II of the Steganographia gave long lists of angel names, along with details on the powers of each, followed by conjurations to call them into service. Once an angel—Padiel, for example—appeared, Trithemius would hand over the message; Padiel would take it to the recipient, who would then mutter another incantation, whereupon the original message would be revealed. It was the occult version of the Western Union telegram, except the messengers were angels, and the master of this encryption technology was, if successful, indistinguishable from God. Woolley claims the *Steganographia* is "primarily a work of cryptography, not magic."[112] But neither Dee nor Trithemius distinguishes between the two disciplines. Books I and II "were full of ciphers, for which Europe's political tensions had produced a growing demand."[113] But if angels could spare the spy operations the trouble of encryption, so much the better. In the 16th century, information traveled at the speed of a horse—unless, of course, angels carried it.

Impressed with its military and intelligence potential, Dee wrote to Cecil in February 1563 describing "the most precious jewel that I have yet of other men's travails recovered," and also "begging for some recompense to his costs which had left him virtually penniless."[114] All courts of significance on the continent had their magi and intelligence officers, but England, a small and insignificant power, lacked this edge. Dee volunteered as an "intelligencer" for Elizabeth to unlock the door to the vast wealth Cabala could provide, if only Cecil would provide a modest income that would allow him to criss-cross the continent purchasing books and making contact with other magicians. Cecil needed someone like him if England wanted to compete with the more advanced continental courts. At least this is how Dee felt.

There is no record of an answer from Cecil. One can imagine Dee waiting, excited someone might pay him to collect books on arcane topics, like the mysterious "Book of Soyga," reportedly written in the Adamic language in which God conversed with Adam. Dee, though, was plagued by financial need and other misgivings, some of which he expressed in his diary. At 36, Dee was no longer young, especially given life expectancy in the Elizabethan age. He describes a dilemma typical of men, who "having hesitated for some time at the crossroads of their wavering judgment, they at last come to a decision: some (who have fallen in love with truth and virtue) will for the rest of their lives devote their entire energy to the pursuit of philosophy, while others (ensnared by the enticements of this world or burning with a desire for riches) cannot but devote all their energies to the life of pleasure and profit."[115] Woolley thinks "it is clear in which direction Dee imagined he would go,"[116] but Dee's letter to Cecil casts doubt on that clarity. Did Dee think asking for money as a spy and cryptographer was compatible with the vocation of a man "who [had] fallen in love with truth and virtue"? If Dee was willing to work for Cecil and Walsingham, he was more likely to be "ensnared by the enticements of this world. . . burning with a desire for riches." Isn't that what magic promised? Dee's diary entry indicates he had gone over to the dark side while still in Antwerp.

In 1563 Philip received troubling reports. Antwerp, the richest city in his empire, was a particular concern. Thirty years after its extermination in Muenster, Anabaptism was making a comeback in the Spanish Netherlands. According to reports from the Inquisition, two Anabaptists were burned at the stake at Alost, three at Louvain, and two at Antwerp. In Brugge, two Anabaptists told the inquisitors the headquarters of the Anabaptist conspiracy was in Antwerp. They also confessed they each had four wives, who called their husbands "Lord," and when the one of the elect tired of a wife, an Anabaptist minister would put her to death quietly in the forest; following the example of their sainted founder Bokelzoon the Tailor. The minister had killed six or seven (it was hard to keep track) of his wives. Unsurprisingly, the Anabaptists also taught it was no crime to plunder Catholics, or even to kill them.

More troubling were the reports about the Jews. In 1563, Philip learned there were now "an infinite number of Jews"[117] in Antwerp who circumcised themselves, assembled in synagogues, and publicly defied the Inquisition. Jews and heretics did what they pleased there. Many who paraded around Antwerp as Jews were marranos from Spain, which meant they were lapsed Catholics who should have been punished by the Inquisition, whose office in Madrid shared information on them with the king. In early 1563, Philip sent Margaret a list of suspects who should be closely watched.

In less than a generation, the Jews had transformed Antwerp into the center of world trade and finance. It was like Genesis in reverse. The Jews had been expelled into "a new earthly paradise" of their own making based on the lucrative trade between the Atlantic and the Mediterranean. The Jewish Spice Trust was a combination of the IRS and the CIA: the Jews collected a toll on goods sold all over Europe while engaging in extensive espionage. The Jewish spy ring stretched from London to Constantinople, and it became a "weapon of the greatest political as well as economic importance."[118]

Spice ships from Portugal, and others laden with immigrants for the Netherlands would first land at an English port, where Jewish messengers from London with the latest news from the continent would meet them and tell them whether the coast was clear. If not, they would disembark, usually at Hampton (now Southampton), proceed to London and wait for a favorable chance to continue their journey to Antwerp. The chief link in the chain of espionage at London was a marrano merchant named Christopher Fernandes. A money-changer named Antonio de Loringue conducted a brisk trade selling bills in Antwerp to the voyagers, for they were not allowed to carry Portuguese money out of England.[119]

One converso who became rich in the Spanish Netherlands was Joao Miques, later known as Joseph Nasi (to signify he was prince of the Jews), the Duke of Naxos, knighted for his service to the Turks. Miques married into the wealthy Mendes family, also Portuguese conversos, who were owed the stupendous sum of 160,000 ducats by the king of France. After growing wealthy through the spice trust and usury, Miques rose to fame as spy minister to the Sublime Porte in Constantinople, and after ruining Sulieman the Sot by "leading the prince into all kinds of orgies and excesses,"[120] he terrorized Christian princes as the Sultan's chief negotiator. He orchestrated factions waging war on Philip in Spain. Because of his contacts, Miques, says Graetz, relieved the sultan "of the necessity of employing spies,"[121] because the marranos in Antwerp constituted a large spy ring that would "cause anxious hours to many a Christian ruler and diplomatist."[122] When the French royal family refused to repay him, Mendes sent Barbary pirates to seize French ships and confiscate their cargoes, which Mendes sold. Mendes launched the Turkish fleet defeated by Don Juan of Austria at Lepanto, and Mendes urged William of Orange to revolt in Antwerp. Under the direction of Mendes, "All

the powers of international Jewry were allied with, if not actually the motive power of, the vast conspiracy which produced the Protestant revolt."[111] If it weren't for Mendes and Jewish support, the Calvinists would have become the Dutch version of the Hussites. With Jewish support, in 1566 they became the manifestation of world revolution.

JOHN DEE VISITS QUEEN ELIZABETH WITH THE OCCULT

Dee returned to England in June 1564, accompanying a marchioness dying of breast cancer who promised to introduce Dee to the queen. Dee had just completed his *magnum opus* of occult studies, the *Monas Hieroglyphica.* He had written his distillation of the Cabala, as transmitted by Reuchlin, Agrippa, Trithemius and others, in 12 days, as if transcribing dictation. The Monas (or monad) "contained in the compressed form of a magic sign the whole of the occult philosophy."[124] He dedicated the book to Maximilian II, the Holy Roman Emperor and father of Rudolf II, who would relocate the court to Prague. The occult philosophy was no grassroots movement; it was to be implemented by princes, even if Dee didn't know which one.

When Maximilian showed no interest in Dee's "cosmopolitical theories," Dee focused his attention on the 31-year-old queen of England. Dee referred to himself as a "Cosmopolites," or a "Citizen and Member of the whole and only one Mystical City Universal,"[125] and it was on the young queen that Dee now placed his hope for the fulfillment of his vision. She would use the Monas as her occult imperial sign and institute occult imperial reform as leader of the Protestant nations of Europe. England was to become the new Protestant world empire to replace the Holy Roman Empire of the Catholics.

In summer 1564, Dee and the queen sat together and pored over his baffling but intriguing book. The queen seemed drawn to it, even if she had difficulty understanding it; she also indicated she might put some of its ideas into effect. She may have even considered herself a magus (or maga). She felt she could cure scrofula with her "royal touch," and that the royal power that emanated from her was "magical." She also felt committed to a magical destiny beyond her power to revoke. When a comet appeared in the heavens, Elizabeth was warned not to look because of the "disasters" it might cause. Elizabeth looked anyway, telling her courtiers, "*Iacta alia est,*"[126] the die is already cast, indicating that she was intent to follow her "disastrous" career to its conclusion. Dee encouraged her, believing disaster would fall on the Catholics, not Elizabeth, who would triumph over their ruin. She would rise as the paradigm of the new world order over the ruins of the old church and the old political order whose destruction would fulfill her destiny. Dee would string her along for years. Four years after Dee introduced her to the Monas, Dee told her he was going to reveal "the great secret for my sake to be disclosed unto her Majesty by Nicolaus Grudius Nicolai, sometime one of

the Secretaries to the Emperor Charles V."[127] He never disclosed the secret, but since it involved Grudius, the Belgian poet, it probably involved alchemy to increase gold bullion by transforming base metals, a topic dear to monarchs' hearts.

Ultimately, Elizabeth and Cecil's stinginess overcame Dee's imaginative vision. So Dee, with no prospects at court, moved into his mother's home at Mortlake, an obscure village on the Thames, where he compiled one of the most impressive libraries in Europe. Many of the books were written by Spanish Jews, like Johannes de Burgo's *Treatise on Magic*, which was written in Spanish but in Hebrew letters. Most of them had to do with magic, including *Liber Experimentorum* by Blessed Raymon Llull, another Spaniard. Like freemasonry, which was made up of exoteric and esoteric doctrines, Dee's library had two levels. Behind the exoteric library, there was an esoteric library, a hidden room Dee called his "*Interna Bibliotheca*." It housed retorts in which he distilled potions from eggshells and horse dung, the same stills whose vapors would eventually poison him with fumes from toxic metals. The *Interna Bibliotheca* contained the magical mirror Sir William Pickering had given him, which would so amuse and impress the queen when she visited, and on the same table lay a copy of Cornelius Agrippa's *De Occulta Philosophia*, which he kept open on the study desk for easy reference."[128]

POPE PIUS V HEADS THE CHURCH AND ENGLAND LEADS THE REVOLUTION

Three years after the Council of Trent concluded, in 1566 Pius V became pope and implemented the council's decrees with a vigor the papacy had not shown for centuries. "The poor had alms given them in abundance, prostitutes were banished from Rome, Jews began hiding copies of the Talmud and of Protestant tracts, usurers trembled, easy-going prelates and priests began to reform their lives. Yes, something had happened at Rome. The candidate of St. Charles Borromeo and of King Philip II was proving to be all they had expected of him, and both rejoiced."[129] Pius V launched a three-pronged attack on the abuses that made the Catholic world vulnerable: he imposed order on the clergy, which meant increasing the level of education in seminaries, ended concubinage, and forced bishops to reside in their dioceses. He used the revitalized clergy, especially the newly created Jesuits, to convert heretics, and if the Jesuits failed to bring about their conversion, he turned to the civil arm to destroy them. And finally, he persuaded the Christian kings to unite in a Holy Crusade against the Infidel Turks. It was an ambitious program, but Pius V succeeded, and successors like Gregory XIII, an exceptional administrator, built on and complemented his efforts. Six successive extraordinary papacies contributed to the most significant *volte face* in the history of the Church,

and it happened not a moment too soon. Sensing the change that came over Rome, the forces of revolution and disorder made their move too.

On the afternoon of August 19, 1566 Thomas Stapleton arrived in Antwerp, unaware he would soon have a front row seat for the revolution. Between five and six o'clock in the evening, Stapleton noticed a gang of Calvinist thugs milling around in front of the main church in Antwerp conducting a bit of revolutionary theater mocking the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin, a feast celebrated four days earlier. William of Orange had conveniently left town, and so, when the mob turned ugly, the task of restoring order fell to the town margrave, who hastened to the church only to find the demonstrators inside, barring the door. Finding an unbarred entrance, the margrave entered the church and demanded in the king's name that the demonstrators disperse. In spite of "many words passing between the margrave and them,"[130] the Calvinists refused, probably because their numbers were swelling, making hollow the margrave's threat of force. Finally, seeing "nothing prevailing, neither by fair words or foul,"[131] the margrave went home.

The mob then began singing psalms, and, as if by prearrangement, an even greater mob swarmed into the church. Since Stapleton was swept along by the human tide, he got to witness what happened inside the church first hand and to report "that which I saw with my own eyes."[132] At about six, the singing stopped, and the sacrilege began. The mob of Calvinist thugs broke images and pulled down altars, organs, and "all kind of tabernacles."[133] They stole chalices to melt for coins to pay ruthless German mercenaries, broke up the seats in the choir stalls, and robbed "the church warden's boxes, as well as for the church as for the poor."[134] When the mob finished, they moved to other Antwerp churches. At St. James Church, the mob left the furniture intact and concentrated on plundering the "diverse little scobbes and boxes of farthings for the poor."[135] Far into the night, the "the zealous brotherhood" plundered churches in Antwerp; they "so followed the chase that they left not one church in Antwerp, great or small, where they hunted up not good game and carried away flesh good store." The plunder was so extensive "to describe particularly the horrible and outrageous sacrileges of that night, an eternal document of the gospel-like zeal of this sacred brotherhood, would require a full treatise of itself."[136] Stapleton noticed the "zealous brotherhood" included "members of the same gang of desperadoes who had thrown down St. Thomas a Becket's image from London Bridge and who squatted impudently at that moment in the canons' stalls in Chichester Cathedral."[137]

The English contribution to the revolution was significant. Virtually all observers noted the destruction was carried out by a relatively small number of well-prepared men, among whom a significant percentage were English criminals. Clough, Gresham's spy in Antwerp, felt the wreckers were paid vagabonds among whom he recognized English criminals. An English diplomat recognized 20 London criminals. Strada, who wondered at the

magnitude of destruction achieved by so few, attributed their effectiveness to diabolic assistance.

The iconoclasts did not limit themselves to destroying images; the Calvinist believers in *Sola Scriptura* destroyed books too. "What shall I speak," Stapleton asks disconsolately, "of the very libraries spoiled and burned, namely of the Grey Friars and the Abbey of St. Michael."[138] It wasn't just old books that were destroyed. The Iconoclast rebellion destroyed the English Catholic printing operation in the Netherlands. Stapleton never again wrote in English. "Until this violent summer of 1566," O'Connell writes, "almost all the Catholic émigré books had been printed at Antwerp."[139] A large number of controversial and devotional books, many of a remarkably high literary quality, were written by exiled Englishmen and printed on presses in Antwerp and Louvain before the Calvinist uprisings. After the riots, "the English printing operation moved *en masse* to Louvain, and two years later, when fresh and much graver troubles broke out, it ceased altogether."[140] It is difficult to assess how widely those proscribed works circulated in England or how much effect they had. One contemporary claimed 20,000 copies were smuggled into England, and a missionary, 15 years afterward, said these "books opened the way" and "did much to bring about [a] change in men's minds."[141] The Earl of Northumberland, leader of the Northern Rising, admitted he read some of them. The zeal with which Elizabethan apologists answered them suggests they had some impact. And, demonstrating coordination, at the time of the riots the Elizabethan police state stepped up surveillance of Catholic literature in England, increasing the penalties for possessing it and efforts to confiscate it. Stapleton thereafter wrote in Latin and devoted himself to answering Calvinists on the continent rather than supporting the Catholic resistance in England.

Within a year, the Calvinists murdered 4,000 priests, monks and nuns, drove 12,000 nuns from their convents, sacked 20,000 churches and destroyed 2,000 monasteries, including their libraries and collections of art. The attack on libraries shows that iconoclasm was not based on a noble Old Testament objection to graven images. It was protracted and sustained cultural warfare to destroy every aspect of Catholic culture. Just as the Mass had been banned in England, Catholic culture would be banned on the continent by the systematic destruction of every artifact associated with it. One incident gives particular insight into the intentions of the reformers: in one Antwerp church, a statue of Christ on the Cross was destroyed but the statues of the thieves on either side of Christ were left standing. The determination to desecrate the body of Christ also manifested itself in the attack on the Eucharist, which invariably was thrown into the mud outside the church and trampled underfoot by men and horses.

Philip was convinced the revolt was the work of an organized conspiracy headquartered in Antwerp. Correspondence with Margaret and others

there confirmed his beliefs. William of Orange's departure hours before the uprising convinced Philip that he was at the center of the conspiracy. His principal co-conspirator, according to his sister, "would be Marco Perez at Antwerp."[142] Perez was a Sephardic Jew, formerly a converso and marrano, who now professed Calvinism. In March 1567, Gresham wrote to Cecil explaining Perez and other "Calvinists" had offered William of Orange "a great piece of money for to maintayne God's word and the promise he made to them that they should not be molested with their religion and preaching until the States had decided the matter."[143] The "Calvinists" in question were Spanish Jews who had renounced the mask of Catholicism for an equally deceptive mask of Calvinism. Once they had established their *bona fides* as "Christians," they funneled Jewish money into the Jewish controlled publishing houses which were responsible for the propaganda war against Philip, Spain, and the Catholic Church. In 1566, the propaganda war became an actual revolution. "From an early period," Dr. Lucien Wolf wrote,

> the Marranos in Antwerp had taken an active part in the Reformation movement, and had given up their mask of Catholicism for a not less hollow pretense of Calvinism. The change will be readily understood. The simulation of Calvinism brought them new friends, who, like them, were enemies of Rome, Spain and the Inquisition. It helped them in their fight against the Holy Office, and for that reason was very welcome to them. Moreover, it was a form of Christianity which came nearer to their own simple Judaism. The result was that they became zealous and valuable allies of the Calvinists.[144]

Perez also had contacts in England, through which he recruited the English thugs active in wrecking churches in Antwerp. Perez also used his influence in England to get his Jewish doctor friend, Rodrigo Lopez, appointed Queen Elizabeth's personal physician. Lopez, like Perez, was a "Calvinist," i.e., a Spanish Jew who abandoned the pretense of Catholicism after he migrated to the Low Countries. After his falling out with Lopez, Perez used his same connections to spread a rumor that Lopez was planning to poison the queen and got him hanged. Poisonings by Jewish physicians were common. Stephan Batory, the charismatic Transylvanian king of Poland, was poisoned by a Jewish physician; some claim the poisoning was to prevent him from launching a crusade to free the Slavs in the Balkans from the oppressive yoke of the Porte. Had Elizabeth crossed him, Perez would have been in position to work against Elizabeth through Lopez. The Lopez affair contributed significantly to the rise of English anti-Semitism in the 1590s.

The web also spread east to Constantinople. In 1566, Joseph Nasi wrote to the Protestant Council of Antwerp, whose president was Perez, promising that if they held out against Philip, the new sultan would send aid. In response, William of Orange wrote to Nasi urging him to ask the sultan

to declare war on Spain to divert attention from the revolt the Dutch were planning in the Spanish Netherlands. William of Orange later rewarded Nasi for granting special concessions to Holland's Jews. The Holy Office claimed Dee "was secretly a part of the huge, invisible international conspiracy that extended from London to Constantinople."[145] Once he broke with the Church, he worked actively with Henry of Navarre, with Jewish agents in Paris and London, and with the Cecils. England, run by a clique of usurers, had become the headquarters of world revolution, just as Moscow would in the first half of the 20th century. "The Protestants of that time," Prescott writes, "constituted a sort of federative republic, or rather a great secret association, extending through the different parts of Europe, but so closely linked together that a blow struck in one quarter instantly vibrated to every other."[146]

CATHOLIC VICTORIES AND DEFEATS
MARTYRS ARE MADE IN ENGLAND

It took a year for Philip to digest the intelligence and respond to the assault. Meanwhile, the Huguenots, encouraged by the audacity of the Calvinists in the lowlands, armed themselves to attack churches in France. In the summer of 1567, the Duke of Alba, under orders from Philip, assembled an army in Milan and marched to Brussels, arriving in August. For the next five years, his army brutally suppressed the Calvinists, Jews, and Anabaptists who constituted the revolutionary movement in the Netherlands. Walsh claims the Duke "had made what he considered just enough show of force to uphold his King's authority;"[147] once the rebels were frightened into submission, he planned to grant a general pardon. Others take a dimmer view. O'Connell claims Alba implemented "his program of political repression and pursuit of heresy with a ruthlessness that has earned him universal condemnation."[148] As a result, "the tyranny of Alba breathed new life into the nationalist cause which had died in 1567 beneath the walls of Antwerp."[149] On June 5, 1568, Egmont was beheaded in Brussels, providing Beethoven with a theme for an overture, and providing a symbol for the cause of Dutch nationalism and its resistance to Spanish tyranny. The Dutch needed all the help they could get because William of Orange's German mercenary horde did not incite warm feelings among the natives as it raped and looted its way through the northern provinces. The major difference between Alba and William was leadership. Alba stayed by his men until Philip removed him from command. William of Orange deserted his own troops after leading them into France and running out of money.

Philip understood he was involved in a religious war; he did not neglect spiritual weapons, especially those wielded by the exiled English. Stapleton and Allen and their fellow English exiles withdrew to Douay, where they purchased two large houses, and, with four students (three from Oxford),

founded the College des Pretres Anglais. The exiles were determined to prepare for the collapse of the Elizabethan regime, when England would have an immediate need for trained priests. The college had an almost immediate effect on English life. One year after its founding, the lords of the north, among whom Allen had stayed a few years before, rose in an abortive counter-rebellion known as the Northern Rising. The brutal repression of that rising convinced Allen and his colleagues that the "holy war of religion" was going to be protracted. One year later, on June 2, 1570, Pius V's bull "*Regnans in Excelsis*" was nailed to the bishop's palace in London, excommunicating Elizabeth and declaring "her people forever released from obedience," thus encouraging insurrection, by telling the English "not to obey her commands and laws."[150] The bull arrived as Elizabeth dealt with the Northern Rising and probably contributed to her cruelty in suppressing it. Other plots followed, although it becomes difficult to distinguish between genuine plots and sting operations set up by Walsingham and his network of *agents provocateurs.*

Training priests in England was out of the question. Since the Mass was a criminal offense, the college at Douay could not assume priests could perform their duties under anything like normal circumstances. They had to be trained as counter-revolutionaries, because only by using subterfuge could they survive in England. This fueled government propaganda that maintained Catholics were traitors simply because they practiced rites outlawed by the state.

Money was a perennial problem for the college, but Philip and the pope made generous donations. In April 1575, Pope Gregory XIII granted the seminary a monthly pension of 100 gold crowns, later increased by 50 percent. Rev. Gregory Martin, the English scholar responsible for the Catholic translation of the Bible, claimed "swarms of theological students and candidates for holy orders. . . were daily coming or rather flying to the college at the mere report of such magnificent liberality."[151] But the money was never enough to cover expenses, not even enough to provide decent meals, as Martin makes clear in his description of the refectory, "where in our time we sat down about six at one table, nearly sixty men and youths of the greatest promise were seated at three tables eating so pleasant a little broth, thickened merely with the commonest roots that you could have sworn that they were feasting on stewed raisins and prunes, English delicacies."[152] Dr. Thomas Bailey rented another house, but accommodation was still insufficient, given "the number of students daily flocking to the seminary from the town, besides those who were expected from England."[153]

With recruits streaming in, Allen and his colleagues decided in 1574 to send priests back to England. By 1580 there were 100 clandestine Catholic priests in England. When Elizabeth died in 1603, 450 had taken part in the English mission, and of those 110 had died the martyr's death. There were Jesuits among those who served (and among the martyrs as well, men like

Edmund Campion) but the overwhelming number were secular priests, who far excelled the intellectual caliber of the Anglican usurpers.

The ordination of priests for England was the second phase of the Catholic Counter Reformation attack on Elizabeth's regime. Like the first, it preserved the faith in small enclaves but did not overthrow the rabidly anti-Catholic regime which knew it held the winning cards if it kept the machinery of the church firmly within its grasp.

Although books opened the way and priests from Douay kept the way open, neither could turn the tide. Douay burst at the seams with eager seminarians, but the 400 priests they sent to England over the last 30 years of Elizabeth's reign could not compete with the staffs of the 8,000 parishes the government had taken over. Cecil and Elizabeth nevertheless responded with bloodthirsty savagery. In fall 1577, Father Cuthbert Mayne was arrested near Exeter with a concealed papal bull on his person. He was convicted of treason and hanged and quartered. One hundred and eighty two more English Catholics would die in this battle. In 1581 the Jesuit Edmund Campion was convicted in a trial that was rigged so blatantly that Cecil had to defend the government in a pamphlet.

English historiography often speculates about when England ceased being Catholic. Belloc places the change at the time of the Gunpowder Plot. Eamon Duffy contests Whig historians by documenting the perduring attraction Catholicism held for the English people. O'Connell attributes the change to the ferocity of the Elizabethan police state: "What long years of passive obedience had begun the violence carried to conclusion and Catholicism after 1605 ceased to be a significant factor in English life."[154] Whatever the date, the unjust situation could only be changed by force of arms:

> The failed Catholic revival in England demonstrated how crucial was the existence and control of the ecclesiastical structure. In Germany and Poland the structure of diocese and parish, of monastery, university and school, though corrupt, was nevertheless intact, and through it the fervor of the Counter Reformation could be transmitted to the people. In the Elizabethan England, this was never the case, and so one might guess the movement never had a chance. One might also guess that long before the armada, most Englishmen had given up the thought of bringing back the pope.[155]

The 1570s, beginning with the defeat of the Turkish armada at Lepanto, brought an almost unbroken string of Catholic victories. In August 1572 the French government launched a pre-emptive strike against the Huguenots in what is known as the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre. Throughout the 1570s the Duke of Alba subdued one rebellious Dutch city after another. Alba's success in what is now Belgium forced the Dutch Calvinists to take refuge behind the maze of rivers and dikes in the northern provinces of Zeeland and

Holland. The Spaniards were invincible in land warfare, but the territory north of the Waal, the Leck, and the Rijn rivers was *terra firma* only in some tenuous sense of the word. The Dutch adapted their tactics to the terrain, fighting defensive campaigns where they could control the territory by flooding the battlefields. They also cultivated contact with England via the North Sea, developing a force known as the Sea Beggars that moved in shallow draft boats. By developing these tactics, the Calvinists were able to hold on to Holland while maintaining contact with England. The opposite was true of the Spaniards, who could neither consolidate their control of the land nor link up with their own navy when the time came for the crucial move against England. In 1576, the Spaniards retook Antwerp, but the subsequent sacking of the city proved to be a public relations nightmare. That sacking would have far reaching consequences, especially for the Catholic exiles in Douay.

THE MOVEMENT OF THE STARS AND THE IDEA OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE

In the months that spanned the transition from 1572 to 1573, John Dee and astronomers across Europe noticed something strange and disturbing. A new star had appeared in the heavens. According to the then regnant view of the universe, all stars (including those wandering stars known as planets) were embedded in concentric crystalline spheres. The outermost sphere separated the universe from the empyrean realm where God reigned in a realm of eternal light. Stars in this sphere were holes letting light through. The appearance of a new star meant the heavens had sprung a leak. The celestial spheres, which were considered eternal and unchangeable, had changed. Since everything on earth corresponded to influences from on high, that meant that the earthly order was about to change too. A revolution was imminent, and it was Dee's task as magus, scientist, and government agent to understand the significance of these changes and harness them politically.

Renaissance astronomy was very similar to the reformed reading of Scripture. In each instance, projection played a large if not the determinative role. Given that the structure of the universe had just changed, the time seemed ripe for a bold move by the Elizabethans. Of course, any sober reading of the military situation during the 1570s would not have encouraged English military adventurism. The Spaniards were proving repeatedly that they were masters of the continent. They had also been the first to colonize America, which Pope Alexander VI ratified by dividing the new world between Portugal and Spain in his bull *Inter Cetera* in 1493. That and the Treaty of Torsedillas effectively excluded England from any role in colonizing the New World.

But who in England recognized the authority of the pope? Wasn't it illegal to do so? If it were illegal in ecclesial matters, could it be permissible in temporal matters, where he had even less authority? The revolution meant

there was no longer one authoritative source or court of appeals. This became obvious when Rome reformed the calendar. The task was long overdue because of obvious discrepancies when the old calendar failed to take into account the extra day which had accumulated each century. Yet England would not accept the calendar reform for another 170 years because of ideology. When consulted, Dee claimed the pope had used the wrong starting date. Another manifestation of this loss of authority was the search for the *prisci theologi*, a quest related to the idea that Hebrew or Soyga or something or other was the language spoken by God. Antiquity became an authority, which led to the promotion of figures like Hermes Trismegistus, devotee of the Egyptian god Thoth, who was praised by Copernicus as older and therefore more authoritative. The Hermetic or occult philosophy was an attempt to trump religious controversies by outflanking them historically. Dee was a major proponent of this school.

Objectively, the times were not propitious to test the most powerful nation on earth and her staunch ally the pope. In addition to a series of victories on land in Holland, Spain had just pulled off one of the most significant victories in the history of naval warfare. In early October 1571, the fleet of the Holy Alliance under Don Juan of Austria crushed the Turkish fleet at Lepanto. Turkish hegemony over the eastern Mediterranean was broken, and God clearly had a hand in the victory at Lepanto. Pius V not only put the alliance together, he sat praying the rosary in Rome while the outcome was hanging in the balance. The victory at Lepanto showed how self-confident the Tridentine Church had become and how effectively the Council of Trent had reinvigorated the Catholics.

In 1571, in the same year as Lepanto, Dee set off to the Duchy of Lorraine to buy laboratory equipment. He returned with a "great cart" laden with flasks and retorts for alchemical experiments. Dee could not have gotten his passport without explicit government approval, so it is safe to assume the government was as interested in alchemy as Dee. Dee's illness, probably from inhaling vapors of toxic metals, also indicated his involvement in alchemy, as did his pursuit of the writings of the German magus Theophrastus Philipus Aurelius Bombastus von Hohenheim, who nicknamed himself Paracelsus or the man "surpassing Celsus," the legendary ancient philosopher.

Dee, in desperate financial straits, wrote to Cecil in October 1574 with a plan for discovering buried treasure. Since metals were related to planets, Dee could locate metals by poring over the motions of the stars. Dee's proposal got pushed aside, but he was soon called to government service anyway. In 1574, the explorer and navigator Martin Frobisher approached the Privy Council with a proposal to seek a northern passage to the Indies and China. Since it was known in intelligence circles that Dee had studied at the University of Louvain with two of the world's leading geographers, the government drew him into the discussion. The time seemed right. Sir Francis Drake was

planning to set off on the voyage on which he would sail around the world. The ambitious Frobisher aspired to become the English Columbus, but he was aware that the fame would go to Drake if Drake returned successfully. As a result, Frobisher tried to steal a march on Drake, with the help of the Privy Council, who felt he could not achieve his goal without first taking instruction from Dee. So Dee was called in to teach Frobisher the "rules of Geometry and Cosmography" and how to use navigational instruments. The Elizabethan establishment also invested in the venture, convinced it would bring wealth to the queen, increase English importance in foreign affairs, and spread the Protestant cause. Leicester invested 50 pounds; Francis Walsingham and his future son-in-law, the poet Philip Sidney, invested 25 pounds each.

The nascent British Empire needed theoretical justification every bit as much as Frobisher needed instruction in the use of the quadrant; Dee provided this justification in a series of books published in the mid- to late-1570s. In 1576 Dee wrote *Brytanici Imperii Limites*, which asserted that British claims to foreign lands extended well beyond the borders of the British Isles. He pursued the idea in *General and rare memorials pertayning to the Perfect art of Navigation* (1577). Dee thus laid the groundwork for British imperialism. Although he cited Mercator profusely in *Limits*, neither book was geographical. The claims upon which the British Empire was based were literary. Dee mentioned the voyages of St. Brendan as antedating those of Columbus by a millennium and therefore substantiating English claims to America's north Atlantic shores. Other English claims were derived from Geoffrey of Monmouth's history of England, including the Brut legend, which claimed England was founded by refugees from Troy. The main peg upon which Dee hung his claim, however, was King Arthur. King Arthur, he reasoned, had promoted exploration long before the upstart Spaniards landed in the Caribbean. He had also provided the DNA for the Tudors. So what could be more logical than to have Elizabeth, the head of a purified British Church, extend the sway of true religion and chivalry over the benighted lands of Greenland, Estotiland, and everything else north of "Florida"?

In November 1577, Dee met with the queen and her advisors at Windsor Castle to plead his case in person. Dee proposed that England, a relatively poor nation, should contest the pope's division of the New World as well as Spain's hegemony over the lands north of "Florida," a geographical entity with no clear boundaries. Dee's presentation was "the first authoritative statement of the idea of a British Empire, and it was delivered to the queen during the period when that Empire was about to make its first appearance on the geopolitical scene."[156] The new empire should be dedicated to spreading the Protestant faith, and England's queen was its definitive expositor. But the new empire was bound up with Cabala too. Dee saw himself as the Saturnine Melancholic visionary, who after long immersion in the sciences of number, would ascend to a second, prophetic state, in which the adept arrives at

prophecies concerning political and religious events. The new Imperium of the Protestant queen would then create a new world order based on the deep insights that the Saturnine philosopher had achieved through contemplating the books of magic in the Cabala. From its inception in Dee's mind, the British Empire was a judaizing enterprise, based on the connection between messianic politics, finance, and magic. It was both the alternative to and the mirror image of the Holy Roman Empire, which the stars had foretold was on its last legs. So if the Spanish Hapsburgs persecuted the Jews by way of the Inquisition, England would welcome them to her shores.

Less than two decades after Dee's death, Sir Francis Bacon would take Dee's vision a step further in his utopian novel *The New Atlantis*. Bensalem is the name Bacon gives to his ideal state; Yates makes clear that Bacon was describing a "Christian Cabalist," i.e., a judaizing, community. The inhabitants of Bensalem had the sign of the Cross and the name of Jesus, but their culture isn't Christian in any orthodox sense. Bensalem is a Christian Cabalist utopia dominated by occult philosophy, magic, and trafficking in spirits, which make it more powerful than societies dependent on traditional scholastic philosophies and orthodox theology. What Bacon doesn't mention is that all these characteristics are directly traceable to Dee. The Cross, for instance, is a Red Cross, which Bacon derived from Spenser's reading of Dee, as put forth in the first book of the *Faerie Queene*. The Red Cross would become the symbol for Rosicrucianism, which is the crucial link between Dee's occult philosophy and freemasonry.

The Jews of Bensalem are merchants—even in utopia some things never change. The Jews of Bensalem are allowed to circumcise themselves and to practice their own religion. Bensalem, in this regard, has a lot in common with Holland. Because they are allowed the free practice of their religion, the Jews of Bensalem (by now recognizable as a combination of the Protestant nations of Holland and England, and North America) no longer have "a secret inbred rancour" against Christ and "the people amongst whom they live."[157] Instead, they "give unto our Saviour many high attributes and love the nation of Bensalem extremely."[158] The Jews are fulsome in their praise of Bensalem. They even believe "Moses by a secret Cabala ordained the laws of Bensalem which they now use, and that when the messiah should come and sit on his throne at Jerusalem, the King of Bensalem should sit at his feet."[159]

The Jews would eventually make their own contribution to the literature of England as the chosen nation, but by then the tradition had already been firmly established by Dee and his literary children, Spenser, Bacon, and Milton. Shakespeare would join that tradition too, especially in the *Tempest*, his tribute to an old and all but forgotten Dee.

England was going to become the magic island through Dee's explication of Cabala, and then they were going to export that vision to the rest of the world by exploration, colonization, and conquest. During his audience with

the Queen, Dee elaborated on her claims to Greenland, Estotiland (i.e., Baffin Island), and Friseland. In May 1578, Frobisher was instructed to create an English settlement on Estotiland as the second step in establishing claims to North America. Dee had no fears about the survival of the settlement because, he said, the natives of Baffin Island spoke several languages, including Latin, had extensive libraries, and brewed their own beer. These fantastic claims would be echoed in the next century when Rabbi Menasseh ben Israel would claim equally implausibly that the lost tribes of Israel had been discovered living in Ecuador. According to Dee's reading of Justinian, who said "what presently belongs to no one becomes by natural reason the property of the first taker,"[160] the English had a right to North America because it had been discovered by King Arthur, St. Brendan the Voyager (who happened to be Irish), and Madoc. All their British descendants had to do was occupy the territory "which the Spaniard occupieth not."[161]

With those instructions as well as his newly acquired navigation science firmly in mind, Frobisher set off on his voyage. Within months he arrived back in England with the hold of his ship full of smooth black rocks, which, he assured his influential backers, contained a high quantity of gold ore. By August of 1578, it had become clear that the black rocks were just that, black rocks. Once it became clear that there was no gold in them, they were all dumped unceremoniously into the Thames, and the voyage's backers, including the Queen, calculated their losses and reminded themselves to be less credulous the next time the Queen's conjurer proposed one of his harebrained schemes.

THE ENGLISH MISSION AND SEMINARIES

On November 4, 1576, word of Alba's conquest of Antwerp reached Douay eliciting "sign[s] of cheerfulness" among the Englishmen which were misinterpreted by the natives as *Schadenfreude* over the calamities of Belgium. Before long it became clear to the English that whatever annoyance the Belgians felt was being fanned into something much more serious by the agents of Elizabeth and William of Orange. The Calvinists, "who formed the kernel of the Prince of Orange's faction" had received orders "to stir up the multitude" against the English "as partisans of Spain."[162] The English Queen was at the bottom of the intrigue. Her plan was to use Orange "to procure the destruction of the seminary, which she both feared and hated."[163] Once the seminary was destroyed, she hoped to apprehend Allen, Stapleton and the other exiles and bring them to trial in England, where their fate, as the hanging of Cuthbert Mayne had shown, was a foregone conclusion. Beginning in the fall of 1576, everything that the English did in Douay was minutely scrutinized and "evilly interpreted"[164] as part of a campaign to shut down the seminary. The Catholics there had received reports that assassins had been

dispatched from England to murder Dr. Allen and his associates. Englishmen of sinister aspect were seen lurking in the town, "to all appearance the kind of men suited for the execution of such a crime."[165] As a result, many seminarians became intimidated. In a little over a year after the inception of the campaign enrollment in the seminary dropped from 120 to 42.

During the next two years, the revolutionary spirit seemed reborn in the Spanish Netherlands, and "many persons of all ranks, even of those who were sincerely attached to the Catholic faith and never dreamed of casting off their allegiance to their sovereign, had been more or less carried away by it."[166] Knox felt much of the blame was ascribable to the Duke of Alba, whose troops sacked Antwerp in 1576. The people felt "their national liberties and privileges . . . had been largely infringed by the Duke of Alba while he was governor." So they "abandon themselves blindly to the guidance of the Prince of Orange and the revolutionary party."[167]

Don Juan continued his negotiations to restore harmony, but Orange and his followers were more interested in revolution. On January 25, 1578, Don Juan broke off negotiations and declared war. Six days later, his new general, Alexander Farnese, the Prince of Parma, crushed the revolutionary army with unpleasant consequences for the English at Douay. On March 14, the newly appointed Calvinist governor told them they had to leave. A week later, the magistrates of Douay reiterated the demand. Allen had scouted a new location for the seminary in Rheims under the protection of the French Catholic Guises. During Holy Week of 1578, the seminarians set out on foot on a four-day journey to their new home. In November the magistrates of Douay invited the seminary back, proving to Knox that the expulsion was the work of a Calvinist cabal, but Allen decided not to return. The situation in the Spanish Netherlands was too uncertain, the borders too porous, the likelihood that assassins from England might do serious harm too great. The idea of a united Netherlands had proven untenable by the end of 1578. On January 23, 1579, the Calvinist provinces of the north established the Union of Utrecht, a *de facto* independent Calvinist state, from which Dutch-speaking Calvinists could continue to exert military pressure on Catholics in the south.

In 1580, six years after the first Douay priest arrived in England, the Jesuits became involved in the English mission. In June, Edmund Campion, SJ, arrived in England amid optimism that Allen's ambitious plan for the conversion of England might be working. Earlier, toward the end of 1575, the Rev. Henry Saw wrote to Allen, "the number of Catholics increases so abundantly on all sides that he who almost alone holds the rudder of state has privately admitted to one of his friends that for one staunch Catholic at the beginning of the reign there were now, he knew for certain, ten." "The heretics," he continued, "are as much troubled at the name of the Anglo-Douay priests which is now famous throughout England as all the Catholics are consoled thereby."[168]

The magnitude of the task before him—the return of England to the Catholic faith—tempered Allen's enthusiasm. The English at Douay and later Rheims, no matter how great their zeal, had very small numbers. And in England they were subjected to sophisticated surveillance and constant persecution. English Catholics had to fend for themselves, and without church governance, abuses were bound to arise. Difficulties arose because the Catholic Church in England

> hath no form of external commonwealth, no one that governeth the rest, no discipline or censures neither to drive the priests nor people into order, no man subject to his fellow, no way to call disorders to account, no common conference, no sovereignty nor subjection; but every one, living severally and secretly by himself, and often far from any fellows, is ruled only by his own skill and conscience, which even among the Apostles had bred disturbance, if by sundry meetings councils and conferences it had not been looked into, and, that notwithstanding, some of the best sort were now and then found reprehensible. . . because no man dare nor well can in those terms take upon him to direct govern and call to account at certain times the rest of the inferior clergy in so great a dispersion and uncertainty of their abode. . . . Therefore where there can be no further jurisdiction or recount of their dealings than the rule of every man's own conscience and knowledge, no marvel if all be not at all times agreeable to reason and our desires.[169]

The mission to England could only be a holding action that kept Catholic hope and practice alive until the situation was resolved militarily, as Parma was then resolving it in Belgium. England needed bishops to run the machinery of the church. Allen was confirmed in his views when Edmund Campion was arrested on July 17, 1581, and, after prolonged torture, died a martyr's death at Tyburn on December 1.

WALSINGHAM INFILTRATES THE SEMINARY

In September 1580, Sir Francis Drake returned in triumph from his voyage around the world. His ship became an immediate tourist attraction, drawing large crowds, some of whom fell off the gangplank into the Thames mud. Impressed with Drake's loot, Elizabeth rewarded his piracy by making him a knight. Three months later, Christopher Marlowe entered Cambridge as an undergraduate. For four years, Marlowe was an impecunious student, taking frugal meals with the rest of the students. In 1585, however, Marlowe's fortunes inexplicably rose. He bought himself an expensive doublet and began dining on meat and wine at many times the cost of the bread and cheese that was formerly his fare. The cause of Marlowe's newfound prosperity came into being during 1581, his first year at Cambridge. During that year, shortly after Campion had arrived on English soil, the Jesuits had established a recruitment

network at Cambridge. In September 1581, one of those Jesuits wrote to Claudius Acquaviva, the Jesuit General in Rome, that "At Cambridge I have at length insinuated a certain priest into the very university, under the guise of a scholar or gentleman common, and have procured him help not far from the town. Within a few months he has sent over to Rheims seven very fit youths."[170] John Ballard and John Fingelow, both of Caius college, were recruited and ended up at Rheims. Ballard returned under the pseudonym Captain Fortescue and was executed for his role in the Babington plot in 1586. Unwilling to let such a threat go unchallenged, Walsingham set up a counter-network of young men who would either make contact with Catholic sympathizers at Cambridge or go to Rheims to infiltrate the seminary from within. In 1585, when England declared war on Spain and sent an expeditionary force to the Netherlands, Walsingham's espionage budget increased dramatically, and one of the first beneficiaries was Christopher Marlowe, whose meteoric rise to fame never completely clarified his political or religious allegiance.

In May 1582, Allen wrote to the Jesuit Agazzari complaining about the tribulations of life in exile, and more particularly about the behavior of his students. The Catholics were fighting a losing battle even in Catholic areas because "the common people sometimes go to the churches of the heretics through fear of the iniquitous laws."[171] The hardships of exile had convinced Allen "it would be easier to guide to salvation a thousand souls in England than one hundred in this exile, which of itself breeds murmurings, complainings, contradictions and discontent. When Moses leads the people through the desert, he suffers much. Even at the very time that God rains down manna and quails and brings water from the rock they are not satisfied, but their soul is with the flesh-pots of Egypt."[172]

In the same letter Allen mentioned they had caught a spy. Richard Baines was ordained in Rheims in September 1581. He had arrived at the seminary in 1578, and for the three years did his best to foment discontent, encouraging students "to mislike the rule and discipline of subjection to their masters."[173] He would engage in "licentious" talk about flesh pies and sex to break the discipline of the seminarians struggling with the rigor of life in penurious exile. Baines liked to portray his actions as the result of a fall from grace, but he had been sent to Rheims as a spy. This is certainly the view Allen conveyed to Agazzari. Rheims had always been high on Walsingham's list of threats to the new order in England. His attempts to spread disunity there were consistent with other Walsingham operations.

It is unlikely that a seminarian would turn from grumbling about the food to plans for mass murder on the spur of the moment. In a long confession in May 1583, Baines admitted that he plotted "how the first President might be made away, and if that missed how the whole company might easily be poisoned."[174] Baines planned to murder the entire seminary by dumping poison into the college well or into the water the seminarians bathed in. Nicholl sees Baines as

the model for Marlowe's *Jew of Malta*, a Catholic-hater who poisons a convent of nuns. Marlowe's Jew is said to "go about to poison wells" and produces "a drench to poison a whole stable of Flanders mares."[175] Baines went about his duties, "daily celebrating Mass," Allen adds with scarcely concealed disgust, "believing himself unsuspected" until "his treachery and illicit dealings with the Privy Council had become known."[176] If Baines had been a Catholic in Protestant England, there is little doubt what his fate would have been. The Catholics instead set him free; before long he was devising new treachery for his Protestant masters, as Marlowe would discover to his chagrin, because Marlowe "was some kind of cog in the operations against Rheims" too.[177]

On the evening of March 8, 1582, the sky over Mortlake turned blood red, portending a momentous change in the sublunar sphere. Earlier that day, Dee the Magus had entertained a visitor who identified himself as Edward Talbot. Talbot was a 26-year-old cripple who wore a cowl that created a monkish appearance. The cowl concealed his ears, which had been mutilated, probably as punishment for counterfeiting or "coining." The visitor's real name was Edward Kelley, a criminal "necromancer," someone who exhumed dead bodies. He dug up a corpse at Walton le Dale near Preston in Lancashire and used it to invoke "some one of the Infernal Regiment."[178] Kelley needed "the Devil's foresight" to figure out the "manner and time of the death of a noble young Gentleman, as then in Wardship."[179] Kelley was a "skyrer," or medium, who could contact angels and summon them to appear. Kelley was not Dee's first skyrer. In fact, Kelley arrived at Mortlake to announce he was to replace Saul, a skyrer who had showed up a few months earlier. Dee's first recorded "action" or seance took place under Saul's direction on December 1581. Saul gazed into a crystal ball and announced he saw the Angel Annael, one of seven angels of Creation and, according to Dee, "the Angel of Intelligence now ruling this world."[180] Annael wrote on the crystal a message in Hebrew letters of transparent gold. A bright star appeared, first ascending and then descending, followed by "a great number of dead men's skulls" and a "white dog with a long head."[181]

EDWARD KELLEY JOINS JOHN DEE

Dee warned Kelley that he was uninterested in what was "vulgarly accounted magic."[182] Rather, Dee wanted to contact "the blessed angels of God,"[183] so they could assist Dee's "philosophical studies." Yates, among other scholars, was taken in by Dee's protestations that he was only interested in "white" magic, which rang increasingly hollow as Dee plunged deeper and deeper into the world of the occult.

Kelley told Dee he had been sent to warn Dee about Saul, Dee's previous skyrer. Kelley was an emissary of a group that previously had sent others to Dee, including Richard Hickman (who would be implicated in the Hesketh plot ten

years later) in June 1579. Hickman gained entry "with the commendations of Sir Christopher Hatton,"[184] which "shows that interest in spiritual communication went right to the top of government."[185] Although Woolley says "this aspect of Elizabethan political life remains largely undocumented and unexamined,"[186] he then gives an impressive list of high government officials under Elizabeth who were deeply involved in the occult and interested in having Dee come up with a military or intelligence application of the occult. He lists Leicester (and by implication Sydney), Pembroke, and, most significantly, Walsingham, the head of Elizabeth's spy network. The links are instructive and problematic. If Kelley was sent by Hatton to work with Dee, whom was Dee working for? Was Kelley sent to spy on Dee? If so, he was the man providing Dee with most of his material. This could mean, of course, that Kelley was a "projector," or agent provocateur sent to implicate Dee in some plot. Walsingham was famous for concocting schemes and was then deeply involved in what became known as the Throckmorton plot. Did Walsingham and Hatton suspect Dee had divided loyalties? Cardinal Allen, after all, had already claimed Dee was a Catholic priest. Even a "*sacerdos uxoratus*," might have bouts of recurring Catholicism, especially if confronted by treachery and disappointment by his new masters.

Kelley's links with Hatton and Walsingham may explain the increasingly political nature of the visions he conjured. During a seance Kelley conducted with Dee in April 1582, the "Archangel Michael" appeared and announced he was going to reveal the governors who rule the lower world by revealing the names of 49 angels, "whose names are here, evident, excellent and glorious."[187] Additionally, Michael revealed an elaborate table of letters and numbers, which described divine government. This table indicated the revelations concerned not personal but political salvation, which would come about through creation of a "new global order run according to godly principles."[188] The new world order was also bound up with a new sexual order. After the seance, Kelley told Dee the "Archangel Michael" had suggested to Kelley that he was to break his vow of celibacy. As Luther and the Anabaptists had shown on the continent, the new world order involved liberation from the constraints of the old. No matter how much the Reformers played it down, sexual liberation and reformed Christianity went hand in hand. Now the very angels were commanding it. Did this mean that "Michael the Archangel" was, as a later age might put it, the representation of suppressed sexual desires? If by that, we mean to the exclusion of an actual preternatural being, the answer is no. If by that we mean a preternatural being, masquerading as an Archangel, was aware of Kelley's unfulfilled sexual longings and determined to manipulate them, the answer is yes. Seven months later, Dee and Kelley conjured up the spirit of King Camara, whose first question was "what is your desire?"[189] The question demonstrates the angels were interested in the desires of those who summoned them and willing to fulfill them in an as yet

unacknowledged bargain. Two days after the appearance of King Camara, Dee had a nightmare in which he was disemboweled after Lord Cecil had entered his house and looked "sourly" upon him. Like the intelligence agents that worked for Cecil and Walsingham in the sublunary world, the angels seemed to be double agents.

For his library, Dee acquired *De Orginibus* by the Frenchman Guillaume Postel, who told of meeting a priest from Ethiopia who told him about a Book of Enoch, lost for centuries to Europeans but well known to Ethiopians. The book contained Enoch's account of the language taught Adam straight from the mouth of God. The man who mastered it could control the universe as God had done through Adam, namely, by speaking or naming things. The passages in Postel's book describing the Ethiopian priest's testimony were heavily annotated by Dee. Imagine Dee's astonishment then when Annael, conjured again by Kelley on March 26, 1583, began writing letters of the celestial alphabet, the language God had spoken to Adam, which had been lost since man built the tower of Babel, and commanded Dee to write them down.

Dee was on the verge of a momentous discovery, the fruition of 20 years work in magic through his study of the Cabala. The discovery would correspond to a momentous change in the heavens. On April 28, 1583, Saturn and Jupiter fell into "conjunction" or "copulation," signaling the end of one historical era and the beginning of another. The era which was coming to an end was the watery trigon under the sign of Pisces. The world would witness the dawn of the era of the "fiery trigon," characterized by "sudden and violent changes," or revolution. Dee immediately corresponded with astronomers in England and on the continent. Richard Harvey confirmed "the watery Trigon shall perish and be turned into fire."[190] A "new world" would come about "by some sudden, violent & wonderful strange alteration, which even heretofore hath always happened at the ending of one Trigon & beginning of an other."[191] Tycho Brahe felt the celestial conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn was "the end of the Roman Catholic Church's supremacy."[192] A Czech astrologer added the "sudden and violent changes" would occur first in Bohemia.

Six weeks later, the Polish Prince Albert Laski showed up at Mortlake. By the end of the summer, Dee, Laski, and Kelley embarked on a mission to Prague, capital of Bohemia, the new home of Rudolf II and his court. Rudolf, whom Walsh describes as "surrounded by Jews, astrologers, Rosicrucians, pseudo-mystics, and quacks,"[193] was the son of Maximilian to whom Dee had dedicated *Monas Hieroglyphica*, and head of the Austrian line of Hapsburgs, the family facing down the English, the Jews, and the Calvinists in the Netherlands. Although he was on the outs with the Polish king, Laski had received the royal treatment in England, where Cecil and Walsingham saw Laski as useful in providing them with a back channel access to the Hapsburgs, with whom England would soon be at open war. Laski came to Mortlake

eager for occult insight. Dee obligingly summoned the angel "Raphael", who informed Laski "Many witches and enchanters, yea many devils have arisen up against this stranger, but I will grant him his desire."[194] It was the sort of response one might expect from the local gypsy, but the mention of granted desires kept the Polish nobleman coming back for more. The suspicion Kelley and Dee were commissioned by Walsingham to bring Laski under control is strong: Walsingham's agent, Charles Sledd, the spy who had penetrated the English College in Rome, had arrived at Mortlake the day before Laski and had spent the night, presumably consulting with Dee and Kelley about the imminent arrival of the prince from Poland. Walsingham's house at Barn Elms was a short walk from Dee's at Mortlake. The fact that Sledd, who may have come to Mortlake from Barn Elms, did not spend the night at Walsingham's indicates that the three men must have conferred until late in the evening. Dee considered Sledd's appearances an ill omen. The outcome was invariably unpleasant, sometimes producing psychosomatic effects like nosebleeds.

If Sledd arrived at Mortlake with instructions from Walsingham on how to use Laski, then Dee probably proposed the trip to Prague to Laski and Kelley. The Queen quickly signaled her approval. Preparing for departure, Dee catalogued his books. While compiling his list, Dee received a visit from the Queen, who then sent him a gift of 40 angels, coins with more than monetary significance. Sir Walter Raleigh also sent a letter assuring Dee of Elizabeth's "good disposition." When Dee and his entourage set off by flyboat down the Thames on September 21, they were a government-sponsored operation. Dee repeatedly said as much, indicating he was embarking on a private mission in the service of the Queen to use "his position as part of Laski's entourage to gather sensitive foreign information."[195]

When Dee left England with Laski, Elizabeth was in something approaching a state of panic, convinced that she was the object of a French-Spanish plot to remove her from the throne. Part of that plan involved orchestrating a Catholic invasion of England. Another part involved getting faithful Catholics in England to rise in rebellion as French and Spanish troops arrived on English shores. English involvement in that scheme came to be known as the Throckmorton Plot. Walsingham was weaving a web of intrigue that would bring a number of prominent Englishmen to the gallows, including Lord Henry Howard, a Catholic who attacked magic and religious enthusiasm in *A Defensative against the Poyson of supposed Prophesies,* an attack on Dee and the Earl of Leicester. Dee is not mentioned by name, but Howard attacks a hermeticist, suffering from "distemper of the brain,"[196] who trafficked in spirits, cast horoscopes, and "sought to entrap Diana in the coils of his occult knowledge."[197] Diana was an obvious reference to Queen Elizabeth; the unsubtle point was "the Earl of Leicester and his Protestant friends had been using diabolic powers to control the queen."[198]

Howard's brother had been hanged in 1572 for involvement in the Northern Rising. Howard was to follow him when he was arrested and executed on charges of treason. Meanwhile others were being implicated in the Throckmorton Plot by a spy named Fagot, a Frenchman who wrote reports in a peculiar French full of mistakes no Frenchman would make. John Bossy claims "Fagot" was Giordano Bruno, an Italian monk newly arrived in England hoping to make his fortune as the most brilliant expositor of the new *occulta philosophia*. Bruno inexplicably became a martyr to "science" when the Inquisition burned him at the stake on the Campo di Fiore in Rome in 1600. Walsingham probably lured him to become an informer by playing on his ambition. In addition to offering Bruno a salary, Walsingham offered introductions to Philip Sydney and Dee, his fellow magus and chief competitor as explicator of the occult. It was probably through Walsingham's influence that Bruno got to debate the Scholastics at Oxford, demonstrating his brilliance. By collaborating with Walsingham, Bruno could aspire to replace Dee as the Court magus when Dee left for Prague. Bruno was encouraged by Dee, the "intellectual godfather to the Oxford party," who "by his departure for Poland with the palatine" had "left a vacancy in England for the position of resident guru."[199]

With the arrest of Throckmorton and Howard, Bruno had done his job; with Dee gone, he could become magus in residence in England. Walsingham probably encouraged Bruno in this, as he had encouraged Dee to take the journey with Laski. The two men were his puppets. Both men promoted a political vision intimately connected with magic as a form of control: "Bruno envisaged a universal monarchy to achieve total moral redemption, assuring obedience by persuasive magic and exaltation of the 'vital spirits' of its subjects: complete freedom through complete servitude."[200] Dee and Bruno were working for Walsingham toward the same goal: the spread of magic as a way of undermining Catholic hegemony over Europe. Dee was to Rudolf what Bruno was to Throckmorton. What Howard said of Dee's influence over the Queen would now apply to Dee's influence over Rudolf at precisely the moment when the war between England and the Hapsburgs was escalating in the direction of open military conflict.

EMPEROR RUDOLPH II'S WEAKNESS FOR THE OCCULT

Dee and Kelley's journey to Prague took almost a year. It was no mean feat to cross the northern European alluvial plain, especially in the dead of winter. Rivers swelled to impassability; carriages got bogged down in mud. Travelers got separated and had to wait in uncertainty at dubious accommodations until reunited. Illness was part of the journey. Another reason for the delay in reaching Prague was their intervening visit to Lask, Laski's ancestral estates in Poland.

Shortly after his arrival in Lask, Dee contacted the spirit Nalvage, which had the face of a child and hair like down. Dee, suffering from a fever for days, asked Nalvage for medical advice and got instead a terrifying vision of Mortlake in flames with his wife lying dead on the ground outside. Soon Madimi, a seductive female who would play a crucial role in the Dee and Kelley marriages, replaced Nalvage. Madimi told Dee the Queen mourned his absence, and Cecil would "come home shortly, a begging to you."[201] Then Nalvage returned and started to reveal "the Cabala of Nature," meaning "all of the universe's secrets" in the language Adam had spoken in Eden. Dee's fingers raced across the pages of his notebook as he struggled to keep up with the angelic dictation.

On July 13, 1584, Dee's 57th birthday, the "Angel Gabriel" announced the angelic revelation was complete. Dee now had "the keys of God's storehouses. . . wherein you shall find (if you enter wisely, humbly and patiently) treasures more worth than the frames of the heavens."[202] Dee could now write the Book of Enoch. In the same month, Nalvage reappeared and told Dee "Go to the emperor," meaning, go to Rudolf in Prague. Apparently Dee was more interested in the Book of Enoch, because on July 31 Nalvage appeared again, furious that his command had been ignored. "Were you not commanded to go after ten days," the angel raged, breathing fire. "I have brought madness into the house of the unjust."[203] Dee left the following day, finally arriving in Prague in August 1584 along with his skyrer Kelley, their servant Edmund Hilton, and Kelley's brother.

In the waning years of the 16th century, Prague was a strange mixture of forces contending with each other over the fate of Europe in the wake of the Protestant revolution. Rudolf's removal of the Austrian court to Prague had attracted hoaxers, con men, occultists, charlatans, pseudo-mystics, and artisans determined to cash in on his obsession with things arcane: "a host of 'charlatans, knaves and blowhards'. . . were drawn to the city's gates by the prize of rich pickings and lax regulation."[204] A Greek, Mamugna, arrived from Famagosta, announcing he was the son of an Italian martyr. Mamugna radiated an aura of mystical power while pulled through the town in a cart drawn by two black mastiffs. The mode of conveyance apparently reflected the power of the message: Geronimo Scotta arrived to sell his potions in the town square in a train of three carriages drawn by 40 horses. According to the court in Vienna, Rudolf was "interested only in wizards, alchemists, kabbalists and the like, sparing no expense to find all kinds of treasures, learn secrets and use scandalous ways of harming his enemies. . . . He also has a whole library of magic books. He strives all the time to eliminate God completely so that he may in future serve a different master."[205] According to a Venetian visitor, Rudolf "delights in hearing secrets about things both natural and artificial, and whoever is able to deal in such matters will always find the ear of the Emperor ready."[206] The angels may have been impatient because they felt that

the emperor's ear was already overburdened. The presence of so many quacks and charlatans proved, if nothing else, that Rudolf's character flaws were well-known. The angels who reported to Dee and Kelley and were, in some sense of the word, part of Walsingham's intelligence network, knew that Rudolf's weakness for magic could be exploited by Dee to serve British interests. The purpose of his trip to Prague was simple. Dee and Kelley were to attack the Hapsburgs where they were most vulnerable, which is to say on their exposed eastern occultic flank.

Walsingham also had other reasons to send Dee and Kelley to Prague. Prague, despite its distance from England, had become a center of Catholic resistance on a par with Rheims and Louvain. After Dee returned to England in 1589, Kelley became a "natural centre for English exiles in Prague."[207] One of those exiles was the amateur alchemist Richard Hesketh, who would go to the gallows as perpetrator of the Hesketh Plot. While Kelley was advising Hesketh on matters alchemical, Kelley was also in contact with Lord Burghley, who importuned him for cures for the gout, advice on how to turn lead into gold to finance the wars in the Netherlands, and information on Catholic exiles, which Kelley would transmit via Matthew Royden, who would figure in Marlowe's demise. Nicholl says "Roydon in Prague," and "Marlowe in Flushing" were "bit-players in the same complex and rather pointless intelligence game which is being played around the reluctant Catholic pretender, their patron, Lord Strange"[208] as well as Lancashire Catholics in exile like Hesketh. Hesketh was hanged purportedly for presenting a "forged indictment to Catholic rebellion"[209] to Lord Strange to remove him as the Catholic pretender, but Kelley most probably identified him as part of the Prague circle of English Catholics. According to Nicholl, "there is plenty to link Kelley with the Catholic cell to which Hesketh belonged."[210]

Kelley would have a much greater impact on Prague and the English Catholic exiles there than Dee. By the time Dee left Prague to return to England, their roles were reversed because by 1589, Kelley had gone from *famulus to magus*, and Dee was all but forgotten. Alchemical formulae "used by Edoardus Gelleus, the English alchemist"[211] were quoted extensively during the 17th century. Walsingham and Cecil ignored the failed Dee when he returned to England, but well into the 1590s, they were still assiduously courting Kelley by letter and envoy, hoping to persuade him to return to England and share his wizardry, or at least the wealth it was reportedly producing, with the English court.

The arrival of Rudolf and his court changed the modality of Jewish activity in Prague. The idea of revolutionary collaboration of the sort which took place during the heady days of 1421, when Hussites and Jews sang Jewish songs as together they dug the trenches that were to prevent the invasion of the King of the Romans, was no longer feasible. In 1584, Utraquism was a spent force politically. The Jews, therefore, got involved in the occult. Since the

Cabala was the ultimate source of *occulta philosophia* that was the intellectual rage in Europe, the change in Jewish activity was not difficult. Indeed, the occult tradition began when Pico and Reuchlin got the idea of magic from the Jews. Now Prague seemed obsessed with the new mechanical man who was a product of magic. The image of the new man appeared in the figures of the town clock, who would parade around after a skeleton rang a bell announcing the beginning of the performance.

Giordano Bruno would follow Dee and Kelley to Prague, probably to cash in on Rudolf's generosity in patronizing those adept in magic and the occult philosophy. Bruno included a fulsome dedication to Rudolf in his *Articles against the Mathematicians*, which "rehearses the whole Brunonian philosophy of a single true universal religion rooted in the occult tradition, and the salvation of mankind through the institutions of an intellectual elite."[212] Like Antwerp, Prague received large numbers of Jewish immigrants after the Spanish expulsion in 1492. These Jews arrived with an interest in Cabala, especially as redacted by Isaac Luria, because its mystical explanation of a universe wracked with catastrophe seemed to explain their own catastrophe. Cabala brought with it the age-old Jewish inclination to millennialist politics, according to which the upheaval in Spain was the first pangs of labor signaling the birth of the messiah. Magic was part of the program of messianic politics for Jews and judaizers, who found common cause in their crusade against the Hapsburgs and the Catholic Church. Many Cabalists found places in Rudolf's court. Aware many of Rudolf's closest advisors were Jews, Dee suspected them of plotting against him. The Jews also were central to the system of imperial finance. The occult revival in Prague under Rudolf was a manifestation of "the blossoming of Jewish intellectual life at the end of the century" that was "based on a renewed study of the Cabala."[213]

The most famous Jew in Prague during the Cabala revival was Rabbi Judah Loew ben Bezalel. Rabbi Loew was an expert in Gematria, but the source of his fame was that somewhere in the Jewish ghetto in Prague he had reportedly created a human automaton, known as the Golem, by his cabalistic arcane science. The Golem was a clay figure that came to life when Rabbi Loew put a tablet with the name of God inscribed on it into the Golem's mouth. To this day, tour guides in Prague claim Loew created the Frankenstein myth, which now finds its expression in the ubiquitous sale of marionettes and puppets in the Old Town. Loew met Rudolf, and the two of them "had a long secretive conversation."[214] Yates thinks Dee may have met Loew in Prague, but from what we know of their journey, Dee and Kelley spent most of their time with Catholics.

In Prague, Dee and Kelley lodged at the home of Thaddeus Hajek, Rudolf's physician. Hajek lived on Bethlehem Square, not far from Bethlehem Chapel, where Jan Huss launched the revolutionary movement in Europe 174 years before. Hajek was one of the foremost astronomers of Europe; he and Dee

had probably made contact when the new star appeared in the early '70s. Dee felt the revolution surrounding the arrival of the Fiery Trigon in the heavens in 1584 would involve the Hapsburgs, and he probably shared those thoughts with his Protestant host Hajek, who could introduce him to his contacts in the scientific world and at the imperial court. Dee's thoughts were probably not new to Hajek. Much of what Dee predicted had already been pointed out by the Czech astrologer, Cyprian Leowitz, and published in a book approved by the Emperor Maximilian. Leowitz predicted sudden violent changes would occur in 1584; Dee heavily annotated that book and probably knew Leowitz personally.

Hajek was also an Utraquist, but Utraquism, like the Anabaptism it spawned in Southern Germany, had had its day in Bohemia. The revolutionary spirit had departed, leaving only an ideological corpse behind. One reason for the demise of Utraquism was the rise of the *occulta philosophia*. Another reason was the Counter Reformation. When Dee arrived in Prague in August 1584, the Counter Reformation had been hard at work there for years. In 1581, the Church had restored the nunciature, which soon functioned as a significant counterforce in intelligence and diplomacy to the English/Jewish spy ring that arranged Dee's mission to Prague. Soon the pope was in a battle with Walsingham and the Jews over the mind of the emperor, the future of Bohemia, and the empire. In that battle, the occult English cabalists had to play catch-up, which might explain the impatience of the angels, because in 1584, Nuncio Giovanni Francesco Bonomi submitted to Rudolf a plan for the "systematic extirpation of heresy in Bohemia."[215] Bolstered by support of the Jesuits and of Catholic magnates like the Rozmberk and Lobkovic families, Bonomi and his successors hoped to implement the Tridentine reforms and bring about a re-Catholicization of Bohemia. This involved conversions, new seminaries, festivals and ceremonials, education, and mission work. "The hope is growing," Botero wrote, "for a total conversion of Bohemia."[216]

Total cultural renovation along lines defined by Trent could not take place without the cooperation of the Emperor, whose weakness for occult knowledge was well known. And so the battle for Bohemia became a battle for Rudolf's mind. If Dee could get to him, Rudolf might inaugurate the era of the fiery Trigon. The nuncio was thinking similarly, but with the opposite goal.

According to Yates, "Dee's message appeared to be neither Catholic nor Protestant." It was instead "an appeal to a vast, undogmatic, reforming movement which drew its spiritual strength from the resources of occult philosophy."[217] Giordano Bruno, who seemed to follow Dee through Europe, was one of many "enthusiastic missionaries" of "universal Hermetic reform, in which there were some Cabalist elements."[218] Hermeticism or Cabala or Magic was, in the era of cultural exhaustion following the early victories of the Protestants, an alternative to Catholicism and Protestantism, which seemed

to have reached a stalemate in their battle to control Europe. Hermetic Cabala was also the alternative to the Counter Reformation, which was exceptionally vigorous. Just how vigorous was obvious when Giordano Bruno mistakenly returned to Italy: Bruno fell into the hands of the Inquisition and was burned at the stake in Rome in 1600. The Counter Reformation was on its way to stopping the Protestant advance and pacifying Austria, Poland, France, the Spanish Netherlands, and, most significant of all, Bohemia.

Through Hajek, Dee met with Don Guillen San Clemente, the Spanish ambassador, as an important step in his quest to get an audience with the emperor. Dee showed San Clemente his crystal ball; the ambassador was favorably impressed. San Clemente was evidently familiar with the arcane writings of the Spanish Cabalist Raymon Llull and felt Dee had made significant progress in explicating them. This did not remove San Clemente's nagging suspicion Dee was an English spy sent by Walsingham to foment trouble in Bohemia, the weakest link in the Hapsburg chain. Dee was an object of suspicion from the moment he set foot in Prague. He was viewed in Catholic circles as a magus and an English spy, if not an *agent provocateur*. San Clemente probably shared his misgivings with the nuncio; before long, the nuncio was expressing the same fears. Even if he hadn't heard the story from San Clemente, Bonomi had heard rumors Dee trafficked in spirits "with the aid of certain magical characters."[219] Bonomi harbored no illusions about the sort of spirits that would respond to Dee and Kelley's conjuring, and he knew they would not look kindly upon the re-Catholicization of Bohemia. Bonomi identified Dee "as a threat to the ongoing mission to bring Prague back into the Catholic fold."[220]

Dee saw the Emperor within a month of his arrival in Prague. After a little chit chat about Dee's *Monas Hieroglyphica*, a book Rudolf had read but found beyond his capacity, Rudolf mentioned that the Spanish Ambassador had told him Dee had a special message for the emperor. Dee then explained, in a manner reminiscent of Dr. Faustus, that when he had given up hope of finding wisdom in books, he had made contact with the angels, and they had a message for the emperor. "The Angel of the Lord," Dee announced, "hath appeared to me, and rebuketh you for your sins."[221]

It was a bold move and bespoke psychological manipulation far ahead of its time. Eventually, the Illuminati, the psychoanalysts, and sensitivity trainers would refine techniques like this into sophisticated forms of control. Knowing Rudolf's obsessive interest in the occult, Dee probably assumed he was in the grip of an immoral compulsion or addiction. By broaching the matter so boldly, Dee hoped to elicit a confession, which he could later use to control the emperor and thereby integrate him into Dee's plan to bring revolution to Prague. Dee was not unlike C.G. Jung, who used the same sort of techniques to control Edith Rockefeller McCormick and her considerable fortune. Jung was well versed in the alchemical tradition Dee

represented. Like Jung, Dee sought the philosopher's stone as something that could not only transform base metals into gold, but which could also bring about psychological transformations, which could have significant political ramifications, especially when they occurred in the powerful. Compared to the ability to dominate the mind of the emperor, changing lead into gold must have seemed insignificant. Dee claimed he had been "enjoined by the angel Uriel to tell the Emperor that he possesses the secret of transmutation"[222] to bring him under his control and bring revolutionary change. "A learned and renowned Englishman whose name was Doctor De," wrote the Lutheran Budovec, "came to Prague to see the Emperor Rudolf II and was at first well-received by him; he predicted that a miraculous reformation would presently come about in the Christian world and would prove the ruin not only of the city of Constantinople but of Rome also. *These predictions he did not cease to spread among the populace.*"[223]

Dee hoped the audience would be the first of many. While waiting for a sequel that never materialized, he and Kelley circulated in occult circles in Prague. If Kelley was having his effect on Prague, the opposite was also true: Prague was having its effect on Kelley. The Jesuits showed an interest in him; he showed an interest in them and the renewed Tridentine Catholicism they were preaching. It was a brand of Catholicism kept out of England by draconian laws for good reason: under the influence of the Jesuits, Kelley showed signs he might return to the faith of his fathers. In Prague, Kelley showed the Jesuits the accounts of his "actions" with Dee. This was reckless, as Dee insisted, but Kelley persisted. In April 1585, Kelley sought out a Jesuit for confession and received absolution for "the crimes and grave errors of his entire antecedent life."[224] This, however, did not keep Kelley from trafficking in spirits, who soon dragged him into dubious theological territory as a prelude to moral fall. The angel Uriel appeared and praised Luther and Calvin, saying with angelic ambiguity that they had their "reward." Whatever their reward was, the political showdown between England and Spain intensified into open war when Robert Dudley, the Earl of Leicester, persuaded Elizabeth and the Privy Council, to take a hard-line against Philip and allow Dudley to lead an expeditionary force to attack the Spanish Netherlands in late 1585.

ALEXANDER FARNESE BUILDS A BRIDGE AND TAKES ANTWERP

It turns out that 1584 wasn't the year of the fiery Trigon after all. As Dee and Kelley dawdled with angels, Alexander Farnese at the head of the Spanish army took one city after another and paralysis gripped the leadership of the revolution. The fall of Dunkirk, Eindhoven, Nieupoort, and Audenhove in 1583 was followed by the fall of Ypres, Bruges, and Dendermond in the first half of 1584. Then the revolutionaries lost their leader too. On July 10, 1584, a

disgruntled petitioner shot William of Orange to death as he left his dining room. In September, when Dee had his audience with Rudolf, the city of Ghent surrendered to the Duke of Parma. Ghent was the largest Calvinist stronghold outside of Holland. Farnese could then march on his enemies from the west, beginning with Nijmegen, where the absence of breakable dikes and floodable polders favored the Spanish army. The tide of battle in the Netherlands had turned.

The tide had turned in other areas too. In April 1585, around the time that Bruges or Brugge fell to Farnese, Sixtus V was elected pope. Unlike Pius V, the ascetic who prayed the rosary as Don Juan battled the Turks at Lepanto, Sixtus was a former swineherd who never stopped being the crafty peasant. After amassing huge amounts of gold, which he lavished on building projects in Rome, Sixtus then turned on the College of Cardinals, transforming them within five years from a group of unruly barons into an assembly of docile civil servants that would run the Church for the next four hundred years. Sixtus also declared war on the 20,000 or so bandits who inhabited the Papal States and brought them under control. He then embarked on the moral reformation of Rome. Adultery was declared a capital crime, punishable by hanging. Sodomy was made a capital crime, and those found guilty were burned alive instead. By the end of his papacy, Rome was reborn from a medieval ruin into the baroque metropolis that it is even today.

Farnese's business was destruction not construction, but his plans were just as ambitious. He wanted to destroy the revolution in the Spanish Netherlands. The key was Antwerp. Located on the Scheldt River, Antwerp's access to the waters of the Atlantic and central Europe had made it the richest city in the Hapsburg Empire. That access made Antwerp militarily significant, too. With Antwerp in Calvinist hands, the Dutch could control whatever came down river. The sea beggars could supply Antwerp from the sea and England in their shallow draft boats, making the southern part of the Spanish Netherlands vulnerable to attack. Farnese could not concentrate his troops to assault Deventer or Nijmegen if he had to leave some behind to defend against possible attacks from Antwerp. But, if Antwerp were in Spanish hands, the Dutch were effectively bottled up in the North. The Spaniards would control what came down the Scheldt. The sea beggars would have no base in the south. And Farnese could concentrate on taking Holland one city at a time.

The situation did not look promising. Antwerp had 100,000 inhabitants, a number ten times the size of the Spanish army. But, perhaps most imposing was the Scheldt River. At Antwerp, the Scheldt was half a mile wide and 60 feet deep at the center of its channel. Farnese could build fortresses on the banks, but, given the range and accuracy of artillery, he could not prevent sea beggars from provisioning the city. Any blockade from the banks alone would be futile, and viewed by the inhabitants with contempt.

Farnese chose another option. Instead of putting gun emplacements on either side of the river, Farnese did what was thought impossible. In one of the great engineering feats of his day, he built a bridge across the river. Once completed, nothing could get up the Scheldt from the sea, and the city was doomed; surrender was only a matter of time.

On August 27, 1585, Farnese, wearing gold filagreed armor fashioned in Milan, entered the city as conqueror. With diplomacy and charm, Farnese overcame the bitterness that accompanied defeat, granting generous terms and defusing the Dutch nationalism that was so detrimental to the Spanish cause under Alba. Philip was overjoyed. "Antwerp is ours," he shouted, "Antwerp is ours." It was the most significant good news since Lepanto. The Jews, though, began leaving, taking their fortunes and relocating to Amsterdam farther to the north. Paradoxically, Antwerp's fall was good news for Walsingham and the hawks on the Privy Council because it enabled them to get the Queen and council to commit to war. Walsingham and Dudley convinced the council Holland would fall into Spanish hands unless England intervened. And so, at the end of 1585, Leicester led an expeditionary force to Holland to "drive the Prince of Parma from their land." England was now part of the anti-Catholic crusade and Elizabeth was its leader.

By the end of 1585, the thought that all Europe might fall to revolutionary forces was no longer tenable. The fall of Antwerp and the entry of England into the war meant a further merging of Jewish and "English" interests, which is to say the interests of the magnates who controlled the country and who avidly emulated the usurers. So capitalism, as we now know it, was a result of the fall of Antwerp. If Farnese had re-conquered Holland, and if England had not resisted the Counter Reformation so effectively, capitalism would not have come into being. Without capitalism, there would have been no communism, and the history of revolution would have looked much different than it does today.

The tide turned in England too, but in the other direction. Deprived of the Mass and a functioning Catholic Church for over 25 years, English Catholics became what the usurpers wanted them to be, docile Erastians who probably would not have supported Philip's troops if they had landed in 1588.

THE ENGLISH POLICE STATE

A NATION OF SPIES AND PIRATES

When Baines returned to England in late 1584 or early 1585 after confessing his role in the plot to destroy the Catholic seminary in Rheims, his prospects were not good. He was a blown agent of no further use to Walsingham as a spy. He could look forward to a return to life in the half-criminal world of con men and scam artists from which British intelligence drew its agents. What he found instead was an intelligence network flush with money and opportunity.

After returning to England in 1559, Walsingham came to Cecil's notice as "most subtle searcher of hidden secrets"[225] and soon rose to prominence as Elizabeth's Secretary of State and, along with Cecil and Leicester, one of the three most powerful men in government. One reason Walsingham proved so useful to Cecil was his contacts from his exile abroad. In Europe Walsingham acquired his famous skill in foreign languages, and the ring of political contacts that would later form the basis of his foreign intelligence network."[226] There Walsingham made contact with the international network of Jewish merchants who became "the backbone of the English spy system."[227]

One of Walsingham's spies was Geronimo Pardo, a Sephardic Jew who passed crucial information to Elizabeth and Walsingham during 1587 about the preparations for the Armada. Bernardino de Mendoza revealed Pardo's role in Walsingham's spy ring in a letter to Philip II from Paris, where he settled after his expulsion from England in 1584. According to Mendoza, Pardo, a member of a marrano family from Spain that was part of a "vast network all over the world," arrived in London in 1587 with a shipload of cargo and "brought on that occasion two packets of letters in cipher, giving a full account of the warlike preparations which were being made in Spain. After translating them, he carried them to Secretary Walsingham, and, within two months, Pardo was on his way back to Lisbon."[228] Pardo returned to London, delivering dispatches to another Jewish spy, Doctor Hector Nunez, while at dinner. After receiving the packet, Nunez "rose in great haste, and went directly to Secretary Walsingham's house."[229] Pardo was arrested when he returned to Spain, but even from prison he tried to smuggle letters to Walsingham. Most of the Jews in Walsingham's spy ring pretended to be Catholics except when in London, where they pretended to be Protestants, taking "the bread and wine in the manner and form as do the heretics."[230]

Walsingham depended on Hector Nunez for foreign intelligence. His biography is a road map of the revolutionary movement in the 16th century. Born in Evora, Portugal, he moved to Antwerp and from Antwerp to London, where he practiced medicine. He married the sister of the spy Bernard Luis, who lived in Antwerp in 1566, when the Iconoclast Rebellion broke out there. Nunez was extensively involved in trade, which allowed him to gather and transmit intelligence. In 1568 he was listed as a member of the Corporation of Italian Merchants residing in London, although his nationality was listed as Portuguese. In 1579 Nunez, under the alias Francisco Pessoa, was listed as a member of the secret synagogue in Antwerp, and through that organization his wife sent money to another Portuguese doctor, Rodrigo Lopez.

Lopez, because of his unhappy fate (he was hanged in 1593 for attempting to poison the Queen) was the most famous of the Jewish spies in England. Lopez joined a Jewish family famous for spying when he married the daughter of Gonsalvo Anes, alias Benjamin George, alias Gonsalvo George, scion of the famous Anes family of spies expelled from Spain. Gonsalvo Anes made

a fortune selling groceries from India and was knighted by the Queen in 1568. He also collaborated with Nunez and Pardo in smuggling operations. After marrying into the Anes family, Rodrigo Lopez spawned a family of spies. Walsingham used Rodrigo's sons as spies to prepare Drake's raid on the Azores.

When Rodrigo Lopez arrived in England in 1560 from Antwerp, he claimed to be a Calvinist. He soon became physician to the Earl of Leicester; his duties included poisoning Leicester's enemies. Dr. Lopez reputedly had "more skill in intrigue than in physic, and . . . more cunning in poisoning than in healing."[231] One contemporary report "strongly" confirms "the common belief that he was willing, for a consideration, 'to use his knowledge of drugs for a deadly purpose.'"[232] In 1586, Lopez was appointed physician to the Queen, but his greed led him to become a double agent, which led him to turn on Marco Perez, who then turned on him, implicating him in a plot to poison the Queen, for which he was hanged in 1594. Lopez was the cause of much popular anti-Semitism in England.

Alvaro Mendez, another member of Walsingham's Jewish spy ring, was the brother-in-law of Dr. Lopez and also related to Joseph Nasi. After making his fortune in India by farming the diamond mines of the King of Nasinga (and cheating him out of his diamonds), Mendez lived in various European cities. By 1580, he was in Paris, where he became, in collaboration with Nasi, a proponent of a homeland for the Jews, as well as the architect of the Anglo-Turkish alliance against Spain, which tied up Spanish forces that otherwise could have been used against England. In 1585, Elizabeth's ambassador to the Porte, Barton, reminded the sultan he had promised under oath to fight the Spanish, calling them "our common foes, all of them cursed idolaters."[233] Even so, Elizabeth turned to Lopez and Nunez to plead her cause with Philip II to ward off the invasion by a Spanish fleet after Parma took Antwerp.

Walsingham, as leader of the Puritan faction, which included Leicester, Sidney, Dee and Spenser, consistently argued for war. Walsingham, whose daughter was married to Sydney, argued England could check Spanish power in the Low Countries by supporting William of Orange, giving the King of Spain "such a bone to pick as would take him 20 years at least, and break his teeth at last."[234] With war just over the horizon, Walsingham's spy agency looked to profit handsomely. In 1582, Walsingham's secret service had a budget of 750 pounds. By 1585, with war looming, his spy budget soared to 2000 pounds.

Baines now made contact with Christopher Marlowe, the Cambridge undergraduate, and recruited him for intelligence work. During spring 1585, Marlowe became "suddenly mobile,"[235] attending class infrequently. Just as suddenly, he began spending much more money than before on food and drink. Marlowe went from a penurious student to a man of the world, spending well beyond the means of the average student. In *Edward II*, Spenser explains

an intelligencer "must be proud, bold, pleasant, resolute/And now and then stab as occasion deserves,"[236] a passage which is especially ironic advice in the light of how Marlowe died.

Corrupted by money and the prospect of travel, excitement, and intrigue, Marlowe soon accepted that his new job involved "much unfaithful dealing towards people with whom he consorted day by day at Cambridge, people whose violent disaffection he in some measure shared."[237] It is difficult to measure the allegiance of people who dedicate their lives to duplicity. Marlowe's job was most probably the ferreting out of Catholic sympathizers at the university. He thus had to pose as a Catholic, which he did so effectively that the university almost refused him a degree, so worried were they that he might "go to Rheims." Only when the government intervened, testifying that Marlowe was in service to the Queen, was his name cleared, and he was allowed to graduate. Nicholl tries to portray Marlowe as a skilled double agent with a foot in both camps ready to spring to whichever side looked to be the winner. In England, judging who might be winning was no easy matter. Mary had reimposed Catholicism and the Inquisition after Edward's Protestant reign. Now Elizabeth was undoing what Mary had done, but who could tell how long the wheel of fortune would hold her aloft?

The agents most likely to succeed in passing as Catholics were Catholics who had turned, but, as Dee noticed in Kelley's behavior in Prague, a Catholic who had been turned could turn back. It is tempting to view Marlowe as a character out of a novel by John le Carre or Graham Greene, which is often how Nicholl portrays him. But the stakes were different then. The battle was much more existential. The beliefs were closer to the existential core of the believer than in the Cold War contest between amoral players who believed in nothing but the will to power. "Is he a genuine conspirator or an agent provocateur? Is he a purveyor of information or disinformation?. . . Often, the only workable answer is that he is both."[238] Or perhaps neither. Another possibility is that a young person lured into England's network of spies might experience revulsion and try to atone for past duplicity by saying what he really believed. Marlowe was, as his contemporaries noticed, fearless. The "wild young Catholic bound for Rheims" turned out to be a "faithful dealer for the government,"[239] but that doesn't mean he had to stay that way, especially after he became aware of what the government was doing.

Walsingham tried to get as many people as possible involved in plots to put Mary Queen of Scots on the throne so that he could entrap and destroy them, and ultimately her as well. There had been the Throckmorton and Ridolphi plots in the past, and there would be the Hesketh Plot in the future, but for 1585 there was the Babington Plot, which would prove fatal to the pretender in Scotland. During summer 1586, Walsingham lured Babington into approaching Mary, Queen of Scots, with a proposal for a rebellion when a Franco-Spanish force invaded the country.

On July 17, a letter in cipher documenting Mary's approval of the plot allegedly passed from Chartley to Babington in London. It passed into the hands of Walsingham, who deciphered it and resealed it, leading to the deaths of Babington and the Queen of Scots. The term alleged is advised here because the original letters have disappeared. Mary denied she wrote the letter. The ciphered versions were used as evidence at the trial. The Catholics never had any doubt: the affair was a plot to justify killing Mary and put an end to Catholic hopes of restoring England to the fold of the Church of Rome. The Jesuit Robert Southwell claimed the "chief plotters" were Walsingham, Leicester, and Cecil. "The matter of Babington was wholly of their plotting and forging, of purpose to make Catholics odious and to cut off the Queen of Scots."[240] Babington and his accomplices were "drawn blindfold to be the workers of their own overthrow."[239] The chief agent of the "chief plotters" was Robert Poley, who would figure in the death of Christopher Marlowe, as would Baines, in 1593. Poley, says Southwell, "was continually with Babington and Ballard. He heard Mass, confessed and in all things feigned to be a Catholic."[242] Poley's *modus operandi* was one of Walsingham's favorite tactics. Poley was arrested as part of the plot and spent a few years in the tower, where he continued to work as a police informer, but none of the Catholics were fooled. While in prison Poley regularly had sex with the wife of an acquaintance and also, according to Southwell, "poisoned the Bishop of Armacan with a piece of cheese."[243] Poley was released from the tower in autumn 1588. Within a month, he was back in government service.

By the end of 1586, Leicester's expedition to the Netherlands had failed. The failure combined with the gruesome executions following the Babington Plot to cast a pall over England. England had become a nation of spies and pirates. Philip learned of Sir Francis Drake's terrorist attacks along the coast of Spain and Portugal, in which unarmed villages were burnt to the ground and their inhabitants put to the sword. A consistent picture of life in the new England was emerging. Freedom was a subterfuge to enslave the Catholic masses. Emancipation from Catholic rule brought the Elizabethan Police State to power. England was a country of professional informers, not unlike the Stasi Police State in East Germany, except Elizabeth offered her subjects capitalist incentives, conferring on them one-third of the goods of the person they denounced. Purified religion meant the growth of the monster state, Leviathan, which demanded undiluted allegiance, and repaid its subjects by reducing the majority to poverty unknown in medieval Europe. Small farmers were kicked off their lands so that magnates could make fortunes raising sheep. The purgatory societies, the guilds, the monasteries, the hospitals, the entire achievement of the Church in providing social welfare in England were dismantled and put to work increasing the wealth of insatiably greedy magnates. The poor were then punished by laws declaring them vagrants and

abbots and by the emergence of a philosophy of greed that blamed the victims of the looting for their misery by attributing their poverty to character flaws.

SEXUAL TRANSGRESSION AND OCCULT KNOWLEDGE

Throughout spring 1586, the evidence mounted among Catholics in Prague that Kelley and Dee were English spies. In March 1586 Dee and Kelley met with Germanicus Malaspina, the new nuncio. Kelley spoke imprudently about reforming the Catholic Church. Malaspina said nothing, but Dee found out later that Kelley's words had filled the nuncio with "inward fury."[244] Kelley just as imprudently told the nuncio's priests he and Dee had written down "copious volumes"[245] of angelic revelations. When a priest demanded to see the volumes so he could show them to the nuncio, Kelly refused, saying they were private. Fillipo Sega, Malaspina's successor, felt the same way about Dee and Kelley, claiming that they were the "authors of a new superstition, if not heresy,"[246] and that they were in Prague to infiltrate the emperor's court. Meanwhile, as if to confirm the suspicions of the Catholics, Dee and Kelly moved into a grand palace, known as the Faust House, even though they had no visible means of support to pay for such a step up in housing.

On May 6, Dee left Prague for Leipzig, where he hoped to meet his servant Edmund Hilton, a courier between Dee and Walsingham. Upon learning Hilton was not expected for 16 days, Dee left the letter he intended to give to Hilton with his host instead. The letter was addressed to Walsingham; in it Dee told Elizabeth's spymaster, "That which England suspected was also here."[247]

By May 24, Dee was back in Prague, where he learned the nuncio had submitted a dossier to the emperor accusing Dee of necromancy and "other prohibited arts."[248] Dee appealed to the Emperor on May 28, but the damage had been done. On June 29, one of the Emperor's clerks arrived at Dee's door notifying him that he and Kelley and their families had been banished from the empire. They had six days to get out of town.

With appeal impossible, Dee and Kelley headed toward the German border, but within two weeks they were back in Bohemia, where they took shelter at the ancestral estates of Vilem Rozmberk and began work in one of his laboratories. Rozmberk was a Catholic of long standing. His forebears had battled Zizka in vain. Vilem held the crown at Rudolf's coronation in 1575, and he was a member of the Order of the Golden Fleece, the Hapsburgs' highest chivalric honor. But Rozmberk had a problem. He had no heir, and if he didn't get one soon, his death would mark the end of one of the noblest families in Bohemia. This probably explains his direct violation of the Emperor's edict by inviting Dee and Kelley to join him at Trebon. Rozmberk was no stranger to occult philosophy and the art of transmutation, another word for alchemy. The murals on the walls of his castle were covered with

astrological, alchemical, and biblical symbols, all interwoven promiscuously. Fertility, next to transmuting lead into gold and changing the dead to the living, was a main concern of transformation. The houses in the town were covered with occult symbols; the colors of the tower overlooking the town were said to have alchemical significance too. Rozmberk had six laboratories, and the one at Trebon was placed at the disposal of Dee and Kelly.

The first transformation was in the state of Dee and Kelley's finances. The men were suddenly flush with money, which they lavished on those around them. Francesco Pucci, an occult fellow traveler whom Dee and Kelley felt was a Catholic spy, was bought off with bags of gold. This liberality, more than their intelligence reports, caused their stock to soar in England. The English court buzzed with rumors Dee and Kelley had turned pewter dishes, flagons, and even bedpans into pure gold, and that they possessed a magic powder, one ounce of which could produce 272,330 ounces of gold. Intrigued, Cecil increased his efforts to lure them back to England, but the magician and his famulus had other issues to resolve.

In January 1587 Kelley returned from a trip to Prague, bearing a jewel-encrusted gold necklace worth 300 ducats that had formerly belonged to the Rozmberk family. Kelley presented the necklace to Dee's wife, with the remark "I commend me to Mrs. Dee a thousand times."[249] It wasn't the first time Kelley had shown an interest in Mrs. Dee. The sexual tension began as soon as Kelley entered Dee's service in 1582, but now it was more insistent. Soon even the angels were talking about sex. During an action on April 17, an angel told Dee: "All sins committed in me are forgiven. He who goes mad on my account, let him be wise. He who commits adultery because of me, let him be blessed for eternity and receive the heavenly prize."[250] The angel Madimi then appeared to Dee along with other angels, who soon departed. When Madimi was alone with Dee, she parted her cloak to reveal she was naked. After noting in his diary that she "showeth her shame,"[251] Dee records he ordered her to leave.

The angels wouldn't let the subject drop. They became strenuous moral antinomians determined to bring Dee and Kelley to their way of thinking, especially on matters venereal. "For all things are possible and permitted to the godly," the angels told Dee. "Nor are sexual organs more hateful to him than the faces of every mortal. Thus it will be: the illegitimate will be joined with the true son. And the east will be united with the west, and the south with the north."[252]

This sounded revolutionary, but hadn't Dee already predicted a revolution when he explicated the meaning of Jupiter's "copulation" with Saturn and the inauguration of the era of the fiery Trigon? As the Taborites had shown, political revolutions always entailed sexual liberation. Sexual liberation was an integral part of what happened at Muenster too. Why should Dee be shocked?

After a few more sessions, Dee understood what the angels were getting at. Dee and Kelley were to engage in the ultimate 1970s suburban lifestyle adventure: wifeswapping. When Dee, who hadn't entertained such thoughts before then, objected, the angel Madimi rebuked him for being insufficiently liberated. "Your own reason riseth up against my wisdom," Madimi told Dee. "Behold you are become free. Do that which most pleaseth you."[253]

Catholics assert that only fallen angels respond to conjurings, and they were only likely to respond if the conjurer put his immortal soul in jeopardy by committing a mortal sin to attract them. Eventually Dee came to the Catholic position, but not in the way the Catholics in Prague hoped he would. Like Faust, Dee "offered my soul as a pawn"[254] to gain knowledge that would lead to wealth and fame.

In her treatment of Dee, Frances Yates goes out of her way to support Dee's contention that he was a devout Reformed Christian Cabalist interested only in "white magic," which meant magic wrought only with the help of good angels. Dee, it should be remembered, was, in Yates' words, the characteristic philosopher of his age. He had created a new intellectual foundation for England, one that stood or fell on his contention that he was involved only in "white magic." The hopes that Dee and Elizabeth and her ministers shared of "some vast all-embracing reform through Hermetic Cabalist influence and particularly through the influence of Christian Cabala"[255] were based on the assumption Dee got his material from pure sources. The fact that the angels were proposing wife-swapping indicated this was not the case.

The same is true of Dee's literary progeny and their hopes for "pure imperial reform."[256] Spenser's *Faerie Queene* is "a great magical Renaissance poem, infused with the whitest of white magic. . . haunted by a good magician and scientist, Merlin (a name sometimes used of Dee), and profoundly opposed to bad magicians and necromancers and bad religion."[257] Spenser got his idea of white magic for "pure imperial reform" straight from Dee, and dramatized it in his great poem, which portrays the Monas as Una and Elizabeth, the virgin queen, as Britomart, the agent who puts the white magic regime into effect. Yates rarely uses the term Counter Reformation. Any misgiving about the regime of white magic in England is dismissed as part of "the reaction against Renaissance magic," which derives from "the obsessive fear of dangerous spiritual forces, which swept over Europe, one of the manifestations of which was the witch craze."[258]

Spenser was not alone in insisting Dee was involved in white magic. In his pro-Dee *magnum opus*, *The Tempest*, Shakespeare's Prospero is a white magician, modeled on Dee. Prospero uses Agrippa's *De occulta philosophia* to "call on good spirits" (Agrippa mentions Ariel by name) to cause "a return to the magical world of the late Virgin Queen, her chastity and pure religion, now continuing and revived by the younger generation. Her philosopher, the

white magician Doctor Dee, is defended in Prospero, the good and learned conjurer, who had managed to transport his valuable library to the island."[259]

Dee's involvement in white magic has political implications in *The Tempest*. Prospero is "the beneficent magus," who "uses his good magical science for utopian ends."[260] The fantasy of Prospero "firmly in control of his magical island through his white conjuring"[261] was to find its actual fulfillment in Walsingham's police state. Far from vindicating "the Dee science and the Dee conjuring" or allaying "the anxieties of the witch craze and establishing white Cabala as legitimate,"[262] Dee's involvement with the angels at Trebon confirmed the Counter Reformation's deepest suspicions.

According to Yates, Prospero is a white magician primarily because of "the emphasis on chastity in Prospero's advice to his daughter's lover."[263] Yates ignores the extremely inconvenient angelic pressure on Dee and Kelley that was the opposite of chastity. Madimi's call to wifeswapping destroys the whole edifice of "pure imperial reform" by revealing it is based on a demonic foundation.

Dee, it turns out, is much more like Dr. Faustus than Prospero. Dee's project for England was based on the fiction there was such a thing as white magic, that he was practicing it, and that the angels who responded to conjuring were good angels. The turn of events in Trebon disproved all that, and showed to anyone willing to see, that the project of a magical England, a "pure imperial reform," was diabolical. If Dee based his occult philosophy on the advice of demons, what else could it be? What other kind of spirit would propose wife-swapping? Good angels? Hardly.

One evening after dinner in spring 1587, Dee brought up the angelic invitation to "the common and indifferent using of matrimonial acts amongst any couple of us four."[264] The women were speechless. Dee retired to his study, where out of his distilling apparatus popped an 18-inch spirit named Ben, who prophesied the fall of Elizabeth and the invasion of England by "one of the houses of Austria made mighty by the King of Spain's death."[265] Later, Dee talked to his wife in private, insisting, "I see that there is no other remedy, but as hath been said of our cross-matching, so it must needs be done."[266] Jane finally agreed but only under certain conditions. After setting the modalities, she expressed the hope "though I give myself thus to be used, that God will turn me into a stone before he would suffer me, in my obedience, to receive any shame or inconvenience."[267] Two days later, Dee wrote up an agreement, presumably signed by all, which "acknowledge[d], that thy profound wisdom in this most new and strange doctrine (among Christians) propounded, commended and enjoined unto us four, is above human reason."[268]

On May 20, 1587, Madimi, the libidinous angel, appeared to Dee to learn if he was ready to consummate the agreement. Madimi told Dee "He that pawneth his soul for me loseth it not, and he that dieth for me, dieth to eternal life. For I will lead you into the way of knowledge and understanding;

and judgment and wisdom shall be upon you, and shall be restored unto you, and you shall grow every day wise and mighty in me."[269] It sounded vaguely religious and vaguely reassuring as long as one didn't ponder the phrase, "he that dieth for me, dieth to eternal life" too closely. Dee must have been reassured: the entry in his diary the following day was "*Pactum factum.*"[270] Forty weeks later, Jane Dee gave birth to a boy. He was christened Theodorus Trebonianus Dee to indicate the place of his conception, but with no indication of his paternity. In the meantime, we are told, that a "rift formed between the Kelleys and the Dees" during the intervening months.[271]

The idea that sexual transgression was the way to attain occult knowledge and mastery over nature thus entered the history of ideas. Nietzsche would express the idea in *The Birth of Tragedy*. Sigmund Freud would appropriate the idea from Nietzsche without attribution and make it the basis for the Oedipus Complex. Percy Bysshe Shelley, who may have read Meric Casaubon's edition of Dee's diaries with Mary Godwin, put the idea into practice when he, Mary, her half-sister, and Byron engaged in the "League of Incest" on the shores of Lake Geneva in Switzerland during the stormy summer of 1817. At the hands of Jung and Freud it would become part of the technology of control they developed from the alchemical tradition. Dee's pact put to rest any idea that good was going to come from his "white" magic. Although no one else knew about the pact then, a reaction against Dee and everything he and his magic stood for began to build at about the time his wife-swapping pact with the angels was fulfilled. The angels were proving more and more unreliable, and Dee's fortunes began to suffer the more he listened to them.

MARLOWE ON THE ROOTS AND CONSEQUENCES OF ENGLAND'S REFORM

On January 29, 1587 the English suffered a serious setback when Sir William Stanley handed Deventer over to the Prince of Parma. The surrender was a huge blow to English hopes in the Netherlands. Stanley, whose name became synonymous in England with treachery, added insult to injury by placing one-third of his 900 men in the service of the Spaniards. The English denounced Stanley in a pamphlet entitled *A Short Admonition Upon the Detestable Treason*, but Dr. Allen and the Jesuits praised him.

When everything goes wrong, people look for a scapegoat, and the English found that scapegoat in John Dee. At the beginning the reaction was not so much against Dee as against magic, particularly as practiced by witches. In 1587 the *Faust Buch* appeared in Germany as a continental expression of the revulsion against magic and the occult. The witch burnings were another manifestation, as was the manual of the Catholic inquisitors, the *Malleus Maleficarum*, or *Hammer of Witches*. In the same year, the King of Scotland attacked witches and witchcraft with publication of his *Daemonologie*. James,

England's future king, condemned those who used conjurations to raise spirits as belonging to "the Divel's school," making no distinction between white magic and black.

During summer 1587, Marlowe was denounced from the pulpit of St. Mary's by the university preacher at Cambridge for "spying on behalf of the seminaries of Rheims and Rome."[272] This denunciation elicited the government's endorsement of Marlowe as its agent. When the Privy Council issued a statement "it was not Her Majesty's pleasure that anyone employed, as he had been in matters touching the benefit of his country, should be defamed by those that are ignorant of th'affairs he went about,"[273] Marlowe was free to graduate and move on to other things. As of that moment, Marlowe seemed to be a Catholic but was really a government agent.

Marlowe was also involved with magic through the Northumberland circle. Through them Marlowe probably came in contact with Dee's ideas. Dee had contact with the group through Hariot, who is mentioned frequently in Dee's diaries. Through Northumberland, known as the Wizard Earl, Marlowe came in contact with Raleigh. Northumberland was suspected of being a crypto-Catholic, plotting political revenge for his father's death, and it was probably Marlowe's job to find out where his sympathies lay or, worse, involve him in a plot like that which ensnared his father. Catholic cells were an obsessive object of government surveillance and infiltration; judging from the Council's certificate, Marlowe was one of its agents in the summer of 1587.

A spy could insinuate himself into a household like Northumberland's as a poet. And it was most certainly as a poet that Marlowe insinuated himself into the retinue of another patron with Catholic sympathies, Lord Strange, whose group of players had as their writers two of the greatest dramatic poets of the English language. Strange died later under strange circumstances, either witchcraft or poisoning, but during the late '80s and early '90s he was the vehicle for Marlowe's emergence as a playwright. Lord Strange was "wittingly or otherwise, a magnet for Catholic conspiracy."[274] Marlowe was known as "a young malcontent with fashionable papist sympathies."[275] As such, he was the ideal agent for spying on Catholics or turning them as he had been turned. But was Marlowe still a Catholic? Baines, the Catholic traitor lately returned when exposed as a spy at Rheims, quoted Marlowe as saying, "All Protestants are hypocritical asses."[276] He also claims Marlowe said "That if there be any God or any good religion, then it is to be found in the Papists, because the service of God is performed with more ceremonies, as elevation of the Mass, organs, singing men, shaven crowns, etc."[277] Even if he was a turned Catholic, Marlowe was still a Catholic, and he might be expected to revert to earlier beliefs under the pressure of disillusionment or revulsion.

All this speculation would be pointless were it not for the evidence of his writings. Beginning in 1587 with *Tamburlaine*, Marlowe took the literary world by storm. Before his death six years later, he produced works of significant

literary merit, but, more significant for our purposes, he produced a sustained critique of what England had become under the tutelage of John Dee. More important still, Marlowe's works were hugely popular and whipped up animosity against the failing project of "pure imperial reform" initiated by Dee and promoted by Leicester, Walsingham, Sydney, Spenser and the rest of the Puritan faction. In *Tamburlaine*, Marlowe portrayed an empire in which Christianity and morality had disappeared in favor of raw political will and expressed misgivings about a British empire of the sort proposed by Dee. The moral of the play is: power without Christianity must of necessity lead to tyranny. If the English abandoned the Church, they would end up at the mercy of some Asiatic despot, no matter where the despot was actually born.

One year later, Marlowe wrote *The Tragedy of Dr. Faustus*. The German *Faust Buch* made clear a year earlier that there was an actual historical prototype named Faust who lived in Heidelberg, but Marlowe took his model from someone closer to home. Robert Greene describes Marlowe as, "Blaspheming with the priest of the sun,"[278] in other words, a follower of Giordano Bruno, when the opposite is the case. Marlowe's Dr. Faustus is a sustained attack on Bruno, as well as Paracelsus and Agrippa, his predecessors. Dr. Faustus is an even more sustained attack on John Dee, the quintessential English magus of his age. It is also a veiled attack on the legacy of Protestantism. Wagner, Faust's assistant, talks like a Puritan. Faustus studied at Wittenberg, where Luther taught Thomas Muentzer, the leader of the Peasant Revolt. Study at Wittenberg left Faustus "swoll'n with cunning of a self-conceit."[279]

> Philosophy is odious and obscure
> Both law and physic are for petty wits;
> Divinity is basest of the three,
> Unpleasant, harsh, contemptible and vile.[280]

Thinking he has mastered all the earthly sciences have to offer, Faustus turns to magic and finds "these metaphysics of magicians/And necromantic works are heavenly."[281] Marlowe is, however, of another opinion. Far from being heavenly, magic is from hell and leads inexorably to ruin: "Tis magic, magic that hath ravished me,"[282] Faustus says, without understanding where magic is going to lead him. Faust wants to be "as cunning as Agrippa was/Whose shadows made all Europe honor him."[283] In this Faustus is like Agrippa's mentor Reuchlin and the other rejecters of late Scholasticism who were seduced by the mumbo jumbo of Cabala not for the truth it explained but for the power it dangled before their disordered appetites. The temptation is like the one that seduced Eve—to become like God—but the manifestations of that power are all mundane. Sex and power, "are those that Faustus most desires."[284]

> O, what a world of profit and delight,
> Of power, of honour, of omnipotence
> Is promised to the studious artisan!

All things that move between the quiet poles
Shall be at my command. . . .
A sound magician is a mighty god
Here, Faustus, try thy brains to gain a deity.[285]

Faust's magic has a political purpose. Like Dee he can promise to put the new occult philosophy to military use by driving the Duke of Parma from the Netherlands.

Shall I make spirits fetch me what I please
Resolve me of all ambiguities,
Perform what desperate enterprise I will?
I'll have them fly to India for gold,
And chase the prince of Parma from our land,
And reign sole king of all our provinces;
Yea, stranger engines for the brunt of war
Than was the fiery keel at Antwerp's bridge
I'll make my servile spirits to invent.[286]

In a note, Marlowe adds a gloss on what Faust meant: "I will have my obedient servants devise even more ingenious instruments of violent warfare than the famous fireship used in Antwerp, 1585, by the Netherlanders against a bridge built by the Duke of Parma."[287]

Dr. Faustus contains a parody of Dee's scheme to use Cabala to find buried treasure.

The spirits tell me they can dry the sea
And fetch the treasure of all foreign wrecks-
Ay, all the wealth that our forefathers hid
Within the massy entrails of the earth.[288]

Cabala or "Jehovah's name/Forward and backward anagrammatized" makes these wonders possible:

Faustus, begin thy incantations
And try if devils will obey thy hest,
Seeing thou hast prayed and sacrificed to them.
Within this circle is Jehovah's name,
Forward and backward anagrammatized
And characters of signs and erring stars,
By which the spirits are enforced to rise[289]

In mentioning the Cabala that "anagrammatized" Jehovah's name, Marlowe implicates the Jews. Mephistopheles confirms the connection, telling Faustus "the shortest cut for conjuring/Is stoutly to abjure the Trinity."[290]

I am a servant to great Lucifer
And may not follow thee without his leave.
No more than he commands must we perform.

For when we hear one rack the name of God,
Abjure the Scriptures and his Saviour Christ,
We fly in hope to get his glorious soul
Nor will we come unless he uses such means
Whereby he is in danger to be damned.
Therefore, the shortest cut for conjuring
Is stoutly to abjure the Trinity
And pray devoutly to the prince of hell.[291]

Throughout *Dr. Faustus*, the occult philosophy is consistently associated with Puritanism. There is a sense of regret at all Protestantism has brought into the world. Magic is only the latest manifestation of what began at Wittenberg, and Faustus at the end of the play wishes he had never been there:

> O, would I had never seen Wittenberg, never read book! And what wonders I have done, all Germany can witness, yea, all the world, for which Faustus hath lost both Germany and the world, yea, heaven itself—heaven, the seat of God, the throne of the blessed, the kingdom of joy—and must remain in hell for ever. Hell, ah, hell forever.[292]

If we substitute Dee for Faustus and England for Germany, we get some sense of how upsetting this play must have been to Leicester and Walsingham and the rest of the Puritans. Marlowe is saying appetite is the common denominator shared by reformed religion (as manifest in *Sola Scriptura* and magic) and "pure imperial reform." Just as Tamburlaine worships power, Dee and his Puritan admirers worship appetite:

The god thou servest is thine own appetite,
Wherein is fixed the love of Beelzebub.
To him I'll build an altar and a church,
And offer lukewarm blood of new-born babes.[293]

If Walsingham was upset at Bruno for "weakening of Protestant resolve for the anti-Catholic crusade at just the time when the Queen had at last consented to the military option,"[294] imagine how he must have felt about Marlowe's plays, which were much more demoralizing for a nation at war to defend Dee's battered construct of England as the land of faeries. Nicholl concludes, "Marlowe's involvement in 'magick,' like his involvement in Catholicism, has this double edge,"[295] but the opposite was the case. Marlowe was as courageous (or as reckless) as Nashe said he was. In *Tamburlaine* and *Faustus*, he launched a public attack against very powerful enemies, and he would end up paying the ultimate price for the freedom of his speech. Frances Yates is more perceptive than Nicholl because she sees that Dee was Marlowe's target when he wrote *Dr. Faustus*. "Audiences," she writes, "would inevitably have recognized Faustus as an unfavorable reference to Dee."[296] She speculates that Marlowe, "in his capacity as a political agent," must "have known something

about Dee's" trip to Prague. "Puritan Christian Cabalists might therefore have felt threatened by Doctor Faustus."[297] These "Puritan Christian Cabalists" included some of the most powerful and ruthless men in England, but that is unmentioned by Yates, who sees no connection between their animus and Marlowe's death. That connection, however, cannot be ignored. Marlowe was proposing a political agenda "entirely opposed" to the "outlook which we associate with the Elizabethan age, the philosophy of Spenser, which looked to Queen Elizabeth I as the Protestant saviour of Europe."[298] Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, "with its obvious allusion to Dee as a conjurer, tended to undermine the Elizabethan Renaissance"[299] by exposing its roots in Cabala. Tamburlaine is Saturnine, the planetary influence associated with the Jews. He wears an "emperiall crowne,"[300] and his empire is the Jewish fantasy of heaven on earth:

> Until we reach the ripest fruit of all
> That perfect blisse and sole felicities,
> The sweet fruition of an earthly crowne[301]

Tamburlaine, Yates notes, was "published at about the time of John Dee's return to England." It is a sustained attack on "the imperial idea" proposed by Dee; it clearly does not belong to the world of Dee's "British Empire." "Marlowe's frenzied emphasis on imperial cruelty and tyranny," Yates concludes, "may even have been intended to be dangerously subversive."[302]

ENGLAND EVADES THE SPANISH ARMADA

When, on February 18, 1587 Mary, Queen of Scots, was beheaded as a result of the Babington plot, a wave of revulsion swept Europe. A clamor arose against the criminal regime in England demanding retribution. It wasn't quite regicide, but it was close enough, and a sign that the world had changed beyond recognition. Regicide proper would take place in England less than a century later, and it was the infallible sign that revolution had taken over a country.

Philip heard the clamor. After years of provocations, each of which taken individually was an act of war, the English showed no sign of relenting in their campaign against Spain. They had escalated the conflict to the point of open war. Elizabeth had condoned a policy of piracy against Spanish shipping. Drake's raids were the tip of the iceberg. In 1585 Elizabeth's favorite, Leicester, led an army of 6,000 men into the Spanish Netherlands, whereupon the States-General made him governor of Holland and Zeeland. Drake renewed his predations on the Spanish Main. Exasperated at English perfidy and appalled at their treatment of Mary, Philip ordered his admirals to prepare an invasion of England less than six weeks after her death. Perhaps it was the haste, or perhaps anger, that clouded his mind, but the plan was flawed from the beginning. Santa Cruz was to link up with Parma's army in the Netherlands and then convey that army across the channel to England where

a Catholic uprising would meet them to sweep the heretics from power. William Allen, lobbying for the plan in Rome, assured Philip and the pope of the loyalty of English Catholics, but Farnese was skeptical and doubted English Catholics would rally to foreign invaders. Beyond that, there was the logistical problem of how to load the ships. The Spaniards lacked a deep water port in Belgium, and Parma could not get his men out to the Spanish ships at anchor because the Sea Beggars still controlled the sea approaches to cities like Antwerp. Farnese wanted time to finish off the Calvinists in Holland. Then with a port like Amsterdam at its disposal, the Spanish fleet could transport Parma's army to England without difficulty.

The armada was launched without resolution of those issues. Kept well appraised of the Spanish preparations by Walsingham's Jewish spies, Drake launched weeks of preemptive strikes along the Portuguese coast, terrorizing towns and destroying irreplaceable stores, even sailing into the harbor at Cadiz and burning 18 warships intended for the armada. Drake's predations caused serious delay.

In anticipation of the invasion, Pope Sixtus V made William Allen cardinal of England so he could assume immediate administrative responsibility for the Church when Philip's troops landed. On the same day, Sixtus wrote a letter in his own hand to Philip, stating in no uncertain terms that delay would be fatal. Two days after the pope wrote his letter the Dutch town of Sluis fell into Spanish hands. One month later, in September 1587, Leicester returned to England with his tail between his legs. Had the armada sailed then, the outcome might have been different. But the Armada did not sail then. Weakened by Drake's raids, it wouldn't sail for nine months. By then the situation had changed dramatically.

In addition, issues arose over which no one had control but which favored the English cause nonetheless. The weather was the most significant of those unpredictable factors. When the armada finally sailed in May 1588, it was immediately blown back into Lisbon harbor by a howling gale, and there it waited for almost three weeks for the storm to blow over. When the armada finally made contact with the English fleet, the terms of engagement had changed since Spain's last major naval battle, the Battle of Lepanto. At Lepanto, a naval battle entailed two ships closing and then grappling as soldiers boarded the enemy ship and fought other soldiers on its decks. Drake, who had been plundering Spanish galleons in the New World, understood his enemy better than it understood him. Drake's strategy was to prevent grappling and boarding. British ships were faster and lower in the water. Their cannons had longer range. Drake used their technical superiority to evade the slower Spanish ships while inflicting damage from a distance.

After the Spanish exhausted their ammunition on their elusive foe, they had no place to land to replenish their stores, much less link up with Farnese's army and convey it to England. Farnese was helplessly landlocked in

Antwerp, a prisoner of the Dutch Sea Beggars, when the weather intervened again; the Armada was blown north, forced to circumnavigate Scotland and Ireland, losing one half of its ships and two thirds of its men. Philip took the loss philosophically, blaming it on the weather and other forces beyond his control. Philip's imprudent adventure, however, would have serious consequences. Parma was never able to regain the initiative and reconquer Holland and Zeeland; eventually Spain reconciled itself to stalemate and the loss of the northern provinces to the Calvinists.

The victory produced a different stalemate in England. The regime of Elizabeth and Cecil had been spared, but it had nothing to show for its efforts. The great Protestant crusade to claim Europe had failed; the aging queen, with no prospect of producing an heir, had to deal with the failure and face a disillusioned population angry at the price they had to pay for it. She was increasingly alone, as the ministers she relied on died. Cecil would hang on until 1598, but her favorite Leicester died within a year of the victory over the armada. Walsingham died in 1590, and Sir Christopher Hatton two years after that. Meanwhile, Poland, most of Germany, half of the Netherlands, and all of France (after the defeat of the Huguenots) had been re-integrated into the Catholic fold, and the Turks (England's unacknowledged ally against Spain) had been thwarted in their effort to dominate the Mediterranean. The youthful vision of the Virgin Queen spreading "pure imperial reform" throughout Europe was gone.

THE JEW OF MALTA BY MARLOWE

Precisely at this inauspicious moment John Dee, the architect of the now failed "pure imperial reform" decided to return to England. Dee had been the victim of a strange alchemical transformation. He had become the apprentice, and Kelley had become the sorcerer. Kelley was granted Bohemian citizenship, and would be knighted (or recognized as already belonging to the Irish nobility) by the emperor, who was continually trying to lure "Eduardos" from Rozmberk to Prague to supervise a great alchemical work. Rudolf promised not to detain Kelley any longer than absolutely necessary,[303] but the experiment needed an expert who could produce "*mercurius solis*" to bring it to successful completion.[304] Kelley's rise to fame in Bohemia was so dramatic that the only suitable comparison is Dee's fall into obscurity in England.

Dee arrived at his home in Mortlake in December 1589 to discover that his library had been plundered. Over 500 volumes had been stolen, four of which were worth almost 600 pounds. Dee would have been justified to take the sacking of his library as symbolic of the wreck of his life's work. The conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn leading to the era of the fiery Trigon had not led to occult reform and political revolution in Europe. The opposite had happened, and it looked as if the same transformations were taking place in

[illegible] career too. The wreck of Dee's library was a fitting symbol of the wreck of his career as magus and the wreck of his hopes for occult reform under Elizabeth's inspired leadership.

On April 6, 1590, Walsingham died of what sounds like cancer of the testicles (a "fleshy growth within the membrane [tunicas] of the testicles). The "fleshy growth" evidently caused an occlusion of the urethra, which in turn caused his urine to come forth "at his mouth and nose, with so odious a stench that none could endure to come near him."[305] Dee sought favor with his successor, Robert Cecil, son of Burleigh, who sent Dee a haunch of venison, but little else, and no money or work.

Publication of the first three books of Edmund Spenser's *Faerie Queene* was almost as inauspicious as Dee's arrival from the continent a few months before. The timing of a tribute to the Virgin Queen as leader of "pure imperial reform" in a crusade on the continent could not have been worse. Spenser had conceived his great work ten years earlier when Dee and his vision of occult British imperialism were enjoying intellectual acclaim and government patronage. Spenser was then in contact with two of Dee's pupils, Philip Sydney and Edward Dyer, and the contact with this circle and its vision of an occult Arthurian "British Israel" inspired him. Dee was "the true philosopher of the Elizabethan age," and Spenser hoped to use Elizabeth, in the "prophetic moment" after the armada victory, "as the symbol of the new religion, transcending both Catholic and Protestant in some far-reaching revelation, and transmitting a universal messianic message."[306] Since the Puritans were judaizers, Spenser tried to use Cabala, via Dee, to launch a new movement of courtly Puritanism, with the English in the role of God's chosen people. Milton, a dedicated student of Spenser, would take up that vision during Cromwell's republic. Dee was a Cabalist and a British imperialist and all of this found its way into Spenser's poem, which arrived when everyone, disillusioned by the failures of the military and religious adventures that vision had inspired, no longer believed in it. A reaction was setting in.

Two years after publication of *The Faerie Queene*, Raleigh introduced Spenser at court, but the introduction gained him nothing. With Leicester and Sydney gone, there was no one to second Spenser's efforts and so his hymn to Elizabethan imperialism fell on deaf ears. Spenser withdrew to "semi-banishment" in Ireland and, after his return to London in 1599, died in poverty. Yates attributes the *Faerie Queene*'s chilly reception to the poem's "expansionist vision" for Elizabethan England that "had become too dangerously provocative by the time it was published."[307] She could just have said occult philosophy was the god that failed. At the very moment Spenser published his hymn of praise to Elizabeth as faerie queene, "the continental reaction," otherwise known as the Counter Reformation, "was in full swing."[308] Dee and now Spenser were dangerously exposed as "adherents of the occult philosophy, which the Catholic reaction, powerfully aided by the Jesuits, was

endeavoring to stamp out."[309] If Dee and Spenser thought the antipathy of the Jesuits would help them in England, they were wrong; the reaction against occult imperialism was beginning there too as a result of Marlowe's plays.

By 1590 Marlowe had become a leader in the attack on judaizing cabalistic Puritanism. In *The Jew of Malta*, he responded to the occult judaizing imperialist philosophy of Dee that had provided the intellectual underpinning for Spenser's *Faerie Queene*. Marlowe had already expressed his misgivings about British imperialism and magic in *Tamburlaine* and *Dr. Faustus*. Now he was expressing misgivings about the group that united those two enterprises, the Jews. *The Jew of Malta* was also an attack on Dee, because it was Dee who had introduced Cabala into English thought.

The main character in *The Jew of Malta* is the merchant Barabas. The name is significant. Barabbas is the Zealot terrorist revolutionary the Jews chose over Jesus, when Pilate offered to set Jesus free. Barabas is, then, the Jewish revolutionary, hoping to create heaven on earth through gold, conniving, and subversion. At the beginning of *The Jew of Malta*, Barabas is surrounded by heaps of gold in his counting house, boasting about the superiority of Judaism to Christianity because of the riches that accrue from it.

> Thus trolls our fortune in by land and sea,
> And thus we are on every side enriched.
> These are the blessings promised to the Jews,
> And herein was old Abram's happiness.
> What more may heaven do for earthly man
> Than thus to pour out plenty in their laps.[310]

Barabas would rather be hated for his wealth than "pitied in a Christian poverty" because, "I can see no fruits in all their faith."[311] A Christian may live by his conscience, but "his conscience lives in beggary."[312] The Jews, on the other hand, "have scambled up/More wealth by far than those that brag of faith."[313] The Jew's wealth is proof to him of the falsity of Christianity.

During the play, the governor of Malta takes Barabas's house and gives it to nuns. Barabas then persuades his daughter to become a nun to recover the money in the house, but he also plans his revenge on the nuns by plotting to poison them. Sometimes," Barabas declaims, "I go about and poison wells."[314] Sometimes he spreads disease. Sometimes he plays the Christian against the Turk to the detriment of both. His twin motivations are love of money and hatred of Christians. As Nicholl pointed out, Barabas sounds a lot like Marlowe's fellow spy Baines, who plotted to poison a Catholic seminary in Rheims. Marlowe, who may or may not have been a Catholic, sounds like a disillusioned paleoconservative who now regrets helping the Jews and the Judiaizing Puritans drag his country into an unwinnable war in the Low Countries, for goals unrelated to the interests of the average Englishman.

Barabas's wealth is associated with the Low Countries, especially Holland, which was becoming fabulously wealthy because of the Jews. England had thrown in its lot with the Dutch Calvinists, and now they, in collaboration with the Jews, were profiting at England's expense.

Barabas knows much about poisons because he is a physician: "Being poore, I studied physic, and began/To practice first upon the Italian."[315] In describing Barabas as a physician, Yates feels Marlowe is describing Dr. Rodrigo Lopez, the Virgin Queen's physician. She says, "The anti-Semitism of the play must surely have been somewhat uncomfortable for the queen, who had employed and encouraged Lopez, the Jew (as she had earlier encouraged Dee, the conjurer)."[316] Like Marlowe, Lopez came to an unhappy end, both victims of the Queen's displeasure. The conclusion is inescapable. An attack on the Jews was construed as a veiled attack on the Queen. Marlowe was pointing to the influence judaizers like Dee and the Puritans exercised over her to the detriment of national interest. The Dee faction had cast a Cabalistic spell on her, as Lord Howard had claimed years earlier.

Marlowe's attack on the Jews and their adverse effect on England was worlds apart from the enchanted magical island Spenser proposed in the *Faerie Queene*. "Marlowe," according to Yates, "is modern; he belongs to the contemporary mood of rigidity and reaction which was sweeping Europe."[317] As such, his "chief target was the Fairy Queen, and all that that conception implied of white magic, imperial reform and Christian Cabala."[318] The moral of Marlowe's *Dr. Faustus* and *The Jew of Malta* is that "magick" derived from the Cabala of the Jews has "ravished" England, and that the Jew has used that magic to corrupt the country. In the end, everyone loses, Christian and Turk alike. The Jew has no loyalty; he plots the destruction of Christian and Turk, playing his enemies against each other:

> Thus, loving neither, will I live with both,
> Making a profit of my policy;
> And he from whom my most advantage comes
> Shall be my friend.
> This is the life we Jews are used to lead,
> And reason, too, for Christians do the like.[319]

At the end of the play, Barabas falls into a boiling caldron and, after calling vainly for help, bares his soul, taking revenge on his victims by explaining his infamy. Again everyone—meaning both Catholic and Protestant—loses when the Jew is allowed free rein in the island kingdom:

> And had I but escaped this stratagem
> I would have brought confusion on you all
> Damned Christian dog, and Turkish infidels![320]

After Barabas' death, Ferneze, whose name sounds suspiciously like that of the Prince of Parma, tells his Turkish counterpart Selim to "note the unhallowed deeds of Jews." "Monstrous treason" is "a Jew's courtesy."[321]

Yates claims Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice* was written in reaction to Marlowe's *Jew of Malta* to ameliorate Marlowe's portrait of the Jew by showing that the Jew's unpleasant characteristics were the result of treatment at the hands of Christians. The argument is plausible, but the tide of history (and reaction) was running with Marlowe and not with apologists for the failed regime of occult Puritanism and its defenders. Shakespeare, Yates tells us, "could live with the Spenserian magic, as Marlowe's plays could not."[322] Audiences who listened to *The Merchant of Venice* or *Midsummer Night's Dream* were charmed by Shakespeare's ability to infuse new life into a failed vision, but that is more a tribute to Shakespeare's art than to the viability of Dee's failed political system. "The audiences at the *Jew of Malta*," though, "were inclined to become anti-Semitic mobs."[323] The reaction had arrived in England, and Marlowe knew how to exploit it: "Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* is seen as belonging to the reaction to the atmosphere of the witch crazes and the attacks on Agrippa. With the assault on occult philosophy of *Faustus* was associated the anti-Semitism of *The Jew of Malta*."[324]

In *King Lear*, Shakespeare again attempts to elicit sympathy for John Dee and his failed vision. Shakespeare got the story of King Lear and his ungrateful daughters from Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, where, according to Yates, "it forms part of the "British Chronicle" which is the preparation in history for the appearance of Gloriana and her messianic role."[325] Shakespeare describes "an ancient British monarch treated with base ingratitude, haunted by false accusations of demonic possession."[326] His identity is clear. "There was a living survivor of the great days of the Spenserian dream whom this description would pretty exactly fit—John Dee."[327] Dee had fallen on hard times after being at the center of the Elizabethan age. After he had returned from the continent with his failed vision of a magic empire, Dee, like Lear,

> was banished from court and society, suffered total neglect and bitter poverty, and might well have felt himself to be the victim of base ingratitude. He who had given so much received no reward. He was moreover pursued by scares against him as a black magician and sorcerer, though he himself had never admitted this charge, proclaiming himself a Christian, as no doubt he was, a Christian Cabalist.[328]

Dee's tragedy, Shakespeare seems to say, is synonymous with the tragedy of the Elizabethan age. The hopeful vision of a world ruled by magic had faded into the reality of the Elizabethan police state, although Shakespeare was not going to risk his life by saying so. Shakespeare's *Tempest* was another attempt to revive the myth. Prospero is what Dee aspired to be: the benign tyrant using magic from Agrippa to rule the island kingdom. According to

Yates. "Shakespeare's great creations—Hamlet, Lear, Prospero—are seen as belonging to the last stage of Renaissance occult philosophy, struggling in the throes of the reaction."[329]

Because his magic derived from the Cabala, Dee/Prospero's kingdom was naturally philosemitic. Because these literary movements, from Spenser's *Faerie Queene* to Milton's *Paradise Lost*, were "fundamentally Hebraic in character,"[330] they prepared the return of the Jews to England. Because Jews like Joseph Nasi and Alvaro Mendes actively collaborated with Cecil in waging common war on Spain in alliance with the Turks, Yates wonders why the Jews weren't allowed to return during Elizabeth's reign.

> Why were the Jews not received in Elizabethan England, as they were in the other main power which resisted their persecutors, Holland? Why, after the defeat of the Armada, was that victory not followed up by the reception of the Jews, resulting in strengthening of trade and economic power in that curious mingling of practical affairs with religious enthusiasm which was characteristic, both of the Puritan millennial and the Jewish messianic outlook? The project of the return of the Jews to England had to wait until Cromwellian times.[331]

Even though "Elizabethan England was a power which resisted the persecutors and the Elizabethan imperial reform included Christian Cabala as an ingredient of the Elizabeth cult, perhaps making possible for a patriotic English Jew an easy transition to the religion of his adopted country,"[332] Yates is unable to explain why the Jews remained excluded by an otherwise philosemitic regime.

The short answer to that question is: Christopher Marlowe. The longer answer involves his relationship with a public that was always skeptical of Dee's cabalistic magic, and, now that they were living under the consequences, had turned against it. After years of plague and a long draining war in the Netherlands, coupled with the threat of another Spanish invasion, followed by sham plots, savage executions, widespread unemployment and government-orchestrated inflation, the mood in England was ugly. Marlowe read the mood of the mob and provided it with a compelling object of hatred by giving them a sophisticated analysis of the occult judaizing philosophy at the heart of the Elizabethan regime. Because he was so skillful in whipping up the mob, Marlowe, the quondam government agent, became an object of government scrutiny and ultimately an object of government attack.

In January 1592 Marlowe was arrested for "coining" in Flushing, and then accused of intending to join the English regiment under Sir William Stanley. His accuser was Reginald Baines, who had plotted to poison the Catholic seminary in Rheims and who had recruited Marlowe into government service seven years earlier at Cambridge. Marlowe was deported to England on January 27, and not released until May 1592. If it was intended as a warning,

the arrest went unheeded. Before long, Marlowe was entangled in other plots whose purpose was clear; as Baines articulated it: "I think all men in Christianity ought to endeavor that the mouth of so dangerous a member may be stopped."[333]

THE DUTCH CHURCH LIBEL AND THE DEATH OF MARLOWE

On May 5, 1593, Londoners awoke to find a long doggerel poem attacking the predatory tactics of Dutch merchants nailed to their church. What became known as the "Dutch Church Libel" showed how deep opposition to the war in Holland and the regime had become. The English were financing a war for foreign interests who were then allowed to settle in London and take trade away from the English. A palpable sense of outrage and injustice suffuses the poem, as the English author denounces the Dutch merchants:

> Cutthroat-like in selling, you undo
> Us all & with our store continually you feast
> Our poor artificers do starve and die.[334]

At another point, the author refers to the Dutch as acting like Jews:

> Your usury doth leave us all for dead,
> Your artifex & craftsman works our fate
> And like the Jews you eat us up as bread.[335]

The Dutchman, the author of the poem complained, is a "machiavellian merchant," expert in "counterfeiting religion." He is "infected with gold," and a predatory usurer "like the Jews." As Nicholl notes, the charges against the Dutch "closely echo Marlowe's *Jew of Malta*."[336] The connection between Marlowe and the Dutch Church Libel is confirmed by the author's assumed name "Tamburlaine," the name of Marlowe's hit play of a few years before. Since it is unlikely that Marlowe would use a pseudonym that implicated him, the poem was most likely written by an admirer or, more likely, someone who wanted to discredit Marlowe by claiming to be his follower. Nicholl feels the latter is the case; "the Dutch Church libel can be seen as the opening move in the smear campaign against Marlowe."[337]

That campaign continued when the playwright Thomas Kyd was arrested on May 11 as the author of the libel. When his lodging was searched, government agents happened to find a manuscript by Marlowe among Kyd's papers, which came to be known as the Arian tract. In addition to proclaiming Unitarian beliefs, the manuscript spoke maliciously of Christ and of his disciples.[338] The manuscript also affirmed that "all Protestants are hypocritical asses" and that Marlowe "persuades men to atheism, willing them not to be afeard of bugbears and hobgoblins. . . almost into every company he cometh."[339]

After being tortured by Elizabeth's thugs, Kyd affirmed he had received the manuscript containing "vile heretical conceits denyinge the deity of Jesus Christ our Saviour"[340] from Marlowe. Taking up the drumbeat of government propaganda, Robert Greene urged Marlowe to turn away from "diabolical atheism" and "pestilent Machiavellian policy."[341] By now, the purpose of the campaign was clear: to incriminate Marlowe, who had become the most visible and effective critic of the failed imperial policies of the Elizabeth and Cecil regime. Nicholl speculates the real target was Sir Walter Raleigh, who had publicly attacked the Dutch and their stranglehold on the English economy. "The nature of the Dutchman," he said, "is to fly to no man but for his profit."[342] Raleigh favored expelling the Dutch from England, and large segments of the mercantile community in London supported him. London mobs, sick of the war in the Netherlands and its ruinous cost, marched in the streets shouting "down with the Flemings and strangers."[343] Marlowe had become a pawn in the Earl of Essex's attempt to eliminate Raleigh as a serious rival.

On 18 May, the Privy Council issued a warrant for Marlowe's arrest; two days later he appeared before the council to defend himself. Without enough evidence to proceed, the council released him. Ten days later, on the evening of Wednesday May 30, 1593, Marlowe was murdered in Deptford, not in a tavern brawl as later reported, but at the house of Eleanor Bull, a relative of Lord Burghley, still the Queen's chief political advisor. Also in the room was Robert Poley, the man who pulled off the Babington Plot a few years earlier, and Ingram Frizer. Marlowe, the quondam government agent turned playwright, had become a dangerous opponent of the regime, and the regime had him murdered by Frizer to stop the spread of public discontent its failed foreign policy was causing in England.

In his obituary, Thomas Nashe praised Marlowe for his courage, claiming he was "no timorous servile flatterer of the commonwealth wherein he lived. . . . Princes he spared not." "[344] Nor, it turns out, did they spare him. Nashe was probably referring to the government's role in Marlowe's death when he wrote: "His life he contemned in comparison of the liberty of speech."[345] Nashe condemned "Puritans," who "spew forth the venom of your dull inventions. A toad swells with thick troubled poison: you swell with poisonous perturbations. Your malice hath not a clear dram of any inspired disposition."[346] Shakespeare was more circumspect. In *As You Like It*, Touchstone refers obliquely to Marlowe's death as "a great reckoning in a small room." On Thursday 28 June, Nicholl writes, "just four weeks after Marlowe was buried, the Queen issued a formal pardon. Ingram Frizer had killed his man in self defense, and the case was therefore closed."[347]

THE END OF AN AGE

The deaths of its *dramatis personae* signaled the end of the age. William Cardinal Allen, the leader of the English Catholics who was supposed to sail home on the Spanish Armada, died in October 1594. Thomas Stapleton, the great Catholic intellectual, died in October 1598. If anyone's death signified the end of the age, it was Philip II, the man who embodied the Counter Reformation even more than the six popes who implemented the decrees of Trent. Philip died in September 1598. The only other person whose death could signify the end of the age was Elizabeth, and she died five years later. Her successor, James I of Scotland, was the author of *Daemonologie*, which explicitly condemned Agrippa as a conjurer.

John Dee would live another five years until 1608, but he would find no favor with the new Scottish king, who felt that Christian Cabala was just another term for witchcraft. Marlowe would have probably found favor with the new king, but Marlowe had been ten years dead when James ascended to the throne. With the accession of James, the reaction against the occult that had been raging in Europe found a home in England. Shakespeare, ever attuned to who was in power, gave full expression to this view in his homage to the Scottish king's aversion to witchcraft, *Macbeth*. Witch burnings would find a home in New England, but not so much in England itself, because the English Puritans had more important concerns.

In 1609 Amsterdam succeeded Antwerp as the Jerusalem of the north when Philip III signed a truce with the northern Calvinist provinces of the Netherlands, thus recognizing *de facto* the Dutch Republic. In 1615 the States General of the United Provinces allowed the Jews to practice their religion publicly. In 1619 the city council of Amsterdam allowed the Jews to live according to their own law, and they began occupying the area around the Joodenbreestraat, where Rembrandt later immortalized their leading citizens in etchings and paintings. By 1650, there were 400 Jewish families in Amsterdam, virtually all Portuguese. Before long they were casting their eyes across the channel to England, where they hoped to find their true home when revolutionaries came to power there.

Chapter Twelve

Menasseh ben Israel and the Failed Apocalypse

In 1632, the year of Spinoza's birth, so many impoverished Ashkenazic Jews descended on Amsterdam that the local synagogue set up poor boxes to collect alms for them "to prevent the nuisance and uproar caused by the Ashkenazim who put their hands out to beg at the gates."[1] The Jews in Amsterdam were very conscious they were strangers in a strange land. They were overwhelmingly Sephardic; they retained Portuguese as the language of their official documents. They were on good behavior lest they offend the Dutch Calvinists. Their self-consciousness stemmed partially from insecurity. The newly arrived Sephardic Jews had so recently thrown off Catholicism that they were unsure how to act in a land that allowed them to live as Jews. As a result, Sephardic Judaism in Amsterdam maintained a distinctly Catholic caste for a long time. The Jews in Amsterdam talked about eternal salvation, which they were to achieve though observance of the Law of Moses, not through faith in Jesus Christ. They also erected cults around Jewish saints, particularly "Saint Esther,"[2] whose feast was celebrated during Purim.

Until 1603 the Amsterdam Sephardic Jews practiced their religion in secret. In 1608 the Jews formed their first synagogue; in 1615 the States General of the United Provinces allowed Jews to practice their religion publicly, and in 1619 Jews were allowed to live according to their law. By then, Amsterdam had two synagogues, the second being Congregation Neveh Shalom or Holy Peace Congregation.

In 1632, a portly 28-year-old raised as an orphan at the congregation's expense, hurried down the Joodenbreestraat, past the home of Rembrandt van Rijn, who would do his portrait a few years later, toward the harbor to meet the newly arrived ships. Amsterdam lies on the Amstel River in the vast delta of the Rhine at the end of the river's journey from the Alps to the North Sea. The Rhine flows more directly to Rotterdam, but Rotterdam then lacked a secure harbor at the lower end of a magnificent and protected salt-water lake known as the Zuyder Zee. The portly man hurrying to be at the quay when the gangplank came down and the passengers descended was one of the second synagogue's rabbis.

His name was Manoel Diaz Soeiro, at least that is what he was baptized in 1604 on the Madeira Islands, where his family of fugitives from the Inquisition was living. He retained that name for business dealings, but like so many Sephardic Jews who threw off the trappings of Catholicism on Protestant soil, Manoel took another name at his circumcision, the name by which he would be known to posterity, Menasseh ben Israel.

The portly young rabbi "of middle stature and inclining to fatness"[3] used both names when approaching newcomers disembarking ships newly landed in Amsterdam. Duarte Guterres Estoque disembarked that day in 1632, and Manoel Diaz Soeiro was there to greet him in Portuguese, giving his Portuguese name. The tenor of the conversation quickly changed when Soeiro revealed his new name, for in revealing his new name Menasseh revealed as well why he was there greeting Portuguese-looking strangers. "He was known. . . in the said city in Hebrew as Menasseh ben Israel," Guterres testified seven years later to the Inquisition in Lisbon, "and he was a publick Rabbi and professor of the Law of Moses."[4] Menasseh ben Israel quickly got down to business. Assuming any Portuguese traveler arriving in Amsterdam must be a secret Jew and a fugitive from Catholicism, Menasseh offered to circumcise the new arrivals and to induct them into his synagogue. That many Portuguese travelers were not Jews becomes evident from the files of the Inquisition in Lisbon, which are full of outraged reports about the ambitious and importunate rabbi from Amsterdam.

Why they were scandalized can be gleaned from another incident. In August 1639, Felician Dourade, a Brazilian, told a story similar to Duarte's. Upon arrival in Amsterdam, Douarde was approached by the same rabbi, who told him, "with much feeling and passion," that the Jews expelled from Spain were still operating clandestinely there because "whatever" the Spanish crown "might do in Spain they would not prevent them from being Jews." "All of the New Christians in Spain," Rabbi Menasseh said, "were Christians by violence."[5] The rabbis and the Spanish anti-Semites were of one mind on this topic. No Jew ever sincerely became a Christian. As a result, Menasseh continued, "every year there went certain Jews from Holland to the capital of Madrid and to many other parts of the realm of Spain to circumcise the New Christians."[6] Menasseh's Jewish companion then restrained the garrulous rabbi: "Hereat the other Jew caught hold of his hand, intimating to him that he did ill to reveal this before the deponent, because he would return to Spain and recount it, and might do harm to the persons of his Nation."[7] The warning cooled Menasseh's garrulous ardor. "After this warning," Menasseh "treated the matter jokingly, saying that he had not meant it seriously."[8]

Menasseh comes across as garrulous and imprudent in Inquisition documents. His actions, though, were purposeful because "Almost every vessel which arrived from the Peninsula brought fresh supporters. . . Sometimes even there were clerics who had been prominent in the Church, or even familiars

of the Holy Office itself, whose reversion to Judaism cased great scandal in Catholic circles."[9]

The most prominent defector was Fray Vincente de Rocamora, spiritual advisor to the sister of Philip II, King of Spain. Fray Vincente was a Catholic priest who had earned a reputation for holiness until he threw off what Graetz calls "the mask of Catholicism"[10] and got circumcised. He then joined the Jewish community at Amsterdam as Isaac of Rocamora. His defection caused the Inquisition to wonder about the loyalty of Spain's Christian Jews, especially the clergy:

> In Spain and Portugal there are monasteries and convents full of Jews. Not a few conceal Judaism in their heart and feign Christianity on account of worldly goods. Some of these feel the stings of conscience and escape, if they are able.

Escape in this instance meant going to Amsterdam, because as one Jew noted, in Amsterdam, "and in several other places, we have monks, Augustinians, Franciscans, Jesuits, Dominicans who have rejected idolatry. There are bishops in Spain and grave monks, whose parents brothers or sisters dwell here [in Amsterdam] and in other cities in order to be able to profess Judaism."[11]

In addition to being "decidedly choleric and outspoken," the Inquisition reports indicate Menasseh ben Israel was "uncritical and extremely credulous," a man who "avidly accepted any traveler's tale," including "how, in China, men made their pots out of wood and their cloth out of stone."[12] Menasseh was an avid devotee of the Zohar and the rest of cabalistic writing. Beginning in 1626, he began a publishing career which included bringing out Jewish apologetics and polemics, including *Conciliador*, which appeared in the same year he was importuning Portuguese travelers on the Joodenbreestraat.

Graetz doesn't think much of Menasseh as a man or a thinker, something to be expected from the man who referred to the Zohar as "that lying book."[13] From the perspective of a German Jew of the Enlightenment, Menasseh was an embarrassing reminder of what Jews were like before "enlightenment." In 1632 Jews like Menasseh ben Israel were on the verge of one of their recurrent outbreaks of messianic political fervor, greedily gleaning the reports of every newly arrived visitor for signs of the imminent arrival of the messiah. Amsterdam, Andrew Marvell noted, became a magnet for the disaffected:

> Hence Amsterdam, Turk-Christian-Pagan-Jew,
> Staple of sects and mint of schism grew
> That bank of conscience, where not one so strange
> Opinion but finds credit and exchange[14]

It wasn't just Jews who went to Amsterdam looking for signs the Millennium was about to dawn. Once the Calvinists had wrested the northern provinces of the Spanish Netherlands from Philip II, Amsterdam became a haven for revolutionaries of every stripe, Christian and Jew. Indeed, during the first

decades of the 17th century, it was difficult to distinguish Jewish revolutionaries from their judaizing imitators. The Jews sounded like Portuguese Catholics, and the English Christians who ended up there sounded like Jews.

In Holland, the judaizers were often Puritans from England, where they were pilloried for their imitation of the Jews. Addressing his first Parliament, James I described Puritans as revolutionaries, a historically prescient description. They were "a sect rather than a religion, ever discontented with the present government and impatient to suffer any superiority, which maketh their sect unable to be suffered in any well-governed commonwealth."[15] The Puritan was "naturally covetous of his purse and liberal of his tongue" and naturally inclined, like the Jews he imitated, to "usury, sacrilege, disobedience, rebellion, etc."[16]

Unsurprisingly, beginning in 1604, many Puritans migrated to Holland, where Amsterdam had a reputation as "the Dutch Jerusalem." From the perspective of a judaizer imbued with imagery of the Old Testament, as Daniel Neal, their first historian, said, "It is better to go and dwell in Goshen, find it where we can, than tarry in the midst of such Egyptian bondages as is among us."[17] "In Holland," Tuchman says, "the Puritan settlers who walked in the footsteps of the ancient Hebrews became acquainted with modern Jews, and the Jews became acquainted with this odd new variety of Christians who advocated religious freedom for all, including Jews."[18]

Given the Puritans' affinity with the Jews, it was not surprising that many of them became Jews after they arrived in Amsterdam. "From the English point of view, Amsterdam was the most prominent city that allowed open and public Jewish life and worship and could be examined as a test case of the eulogists of Jewish toleration."[19]

One of the English judaizers drawn to Amsterdam was John Traske, who arrived in London in 1617 and began preaching sermons that mixed Jewish and Christian traditions. Then his follower Hamlet Jackson had a vision in which he "fancy'd he saw. . . a shining Light about him, which struck him with Amazement. Hereupon he concluded that the Light of the Law was more fully discover'd to him, than to any since the Apostles."[20] Like the Puritan Cutter in the play by Cowley, who "had a vision which whispered to me through a key-hole, 'Go call thyself Abednego,'" Jackson's vision convinced him "of the necessity of keeping the Saturday Sabbath according to the full Mosaic law."[21] He convinced Traske, who then convinced his followers, that "the Old Testament Mosaic laws applied to Christians as well as Jews."[22] The Traskeites gave scandal by keeping the Sabbath on Saturday and working on the Lord's Day, Sunday. Traske and Jackson muddled Jewish and Christian ideas so convincingly that many of their followers and opponents were convinced the Traskeites "think they may be Jewes, for ought they know to the contrary; and therefore conclude, that seeing they do doubt, it is safest for them to keep Sabbaths, and to live as do the Jewes."[23]

Traske and his followers were arrested in early 1618. In February, John Chamberlain wrote to Sir Dudly Carelton about "one Trash or Thrash who was first a Puritan, then a separatist, and now is become a Jewish Christian, observing the Sabbath on Saturday, abstaining from swines-flesh and all things commanded by the law. You will not thincke what a number of foolish followers he hath in this town and some other parts, and yet he hath not been long of this opinion. He and divers of them are in prison, but continue obstinate, whereby a man may see there can arise no such absurd opinion but shall find followers and disciples."[24] In June 1618, Traske was sentenced "to be burnte in the forehead with the lettre J: in token that hee broached Jewish opynions."[25] He was also sentenced to life imprisonment in the Fleet "to prevent him from infecting others."[26]

Jacobite authorities considered judaizing dangerously subversive of the civil order. Commenting on the Traske case, Lancelot Andrewes wrote "It is a good work to make a Jew a Christian, but to make Christian men Jews, hath ever been holden a foul act and severely to be punished."[27] From Andrewes' perspective, Traske was a "very christened Jew, a Maran, the worst sort of Jews that is."[28] James I followed the case closely and mentioned Traske and the dangers of judaizing in his *Meditation Upon the Lords Prayer*, published in 1619. "Trust not," the king warned his subjects, "to that private spirite or holy ghost which our Puritanes glory in; for then a little fierie zeale will make them turnen Separatist, and then proceed still on from Brownist to some one Sect or other of Anabaptist, and from one of these to another, then to become a Iudaized Traskeite, and in the ende a profane Familist."[29]

Prison apparently brought Traske to his senses. After release, he renounced judaizing: "as I have been stout for Moses, and Christ together: so I may be as resolute for Christ alone."[30] Hamlet Jackson, however, persisted in his views by taking them to their logical conclusion. After release from prison, Jackson "seems to have given up judaizing observations in favour of outright conversion to Judaism in Amsterdam."[31] After the rabbis in Amsterdam told Jackson and Christopher Sands, another Traskeite, that they would have to be circumcised, Sands had second thoughts, deciding he "was content only to be a National Saint, or Saint of the Gentiles, by observing the seven [Noachide] precepts."[32] Jackson, however, was not deterred; "he would be circumcised and so made Jewish Proselyte."[33] One Englishman reported that by 1634 some of the Traskeites had "returned to the Church, some to profaneness, others fallen to flat Judaism."[34]

The Jews followed the story of the judaizing Puritans with increasing interest:

> If contemporary reports are correct in their claim that a number of Traskeites did go to Amsterdam to make contact with the Jewish community there, then we may have discovered the first tentative

> links between religious radicals in England and the influential Jewish community in Holland, links which would become very important when Dutch rabbi Menasseh ben Israel would be invited to present his case to the Council of State.[35]

The Dutch Jews and the English Puritans had much in common. Both hated Spain and the Catholic Church, and both felt the messiah's coming was imminent. Barbara Tuchman says, "It was widely believed in England and other Protestant countries that the year 1666 was going to be decisive in the fate of the Jews, either by their conversion or by the restoration of their temporal kingdom, which would be the signal for the downfall of the Pope."[36] This excitement passed between the judaizers and the Jews, like two basketball players on a fast break to the Millennium. After attending a conference with hundreds of rabbis in Budapest in 1650, Samuel Bert reported that, with Puritanism in power in England, conversion of the Jews was imminent, as the fact of this congress proved. Rome was a hindrance to the conversion of the Jews because "it is an idolatrous church with woman gods and graven images."[37] With Rome on its last legs, the Protestants could usher in the Millennium by bringing about the conversion of the Jews.

In 1621 the Puritans forced the issue in Parliament by proposing Coke's Sabbath bill. Archbishop Laud denounced the bill as leading many to "Enclyne to Judaisme as the newe sect of the Thraskites and other opinionists concerninge the terrene Kingdome of the Jewes."[38] At the heart of the "errors of the Jews" lay the temptation to look for heaven on earth, an "idle conceit" Laud found in Finch's book, *The Calling of the Jews*. Laud denounced it in a sermon on June 19, 1621:

> It was an old error of the Jews, which denied Christ come, that when their Messias did come, they should have a most glorious temporal kingdom, and who but they? I cannot say the author of this vanity denies Christ come, God forbid;—but this I must say, that many places of the Old Testament, which concern the "resurrection from the dead," and which look upon Christ in his first or second coming, are impiously applied to this return of the Jews, which, saith he, "is to them as a resurrection from the dead." And this exquisite arithmetician. . . hath found a "third" between "one" and "two," namely, His coming to this conversion of the Jews.[39]

Laud was battling an early form of Dispensationalism and the carnal idea of heaven that went along with it. Unlike the Jews and their imitators, Christians believe that "this new-built Jerusalem must be heavenly and new. Yea, but it is against the received judgment of the Church, that these places should be understood of any Church upon earth only, whether Jew, or Gentile, or both."[40]

Laud debunks the idea the ten lost tribes are waiting in the wings to usher in Armageddon, saying they no longer existed as a "distinct people." The ten lost tribes were, Laud continues, "degenerated and lived mixed with other nations that captived them till not only their tribes were confounded, but their name also utterly lost, for almost two thousand years since."[41] The claim "now, forsooth, we shall see them abroad again" and they shall "root out both the Pope and the Turk, our two great enemies" is so absurd that Laud "cannot tell here, whether it be Balaam that prophesieth, or the beast he rode on."[42] Anyone who claims "Christ shall be king" over a worldly kingdom "unthrones Christ again and assures us 'One shall be king, whom the Jews shall set up for themselves.'"[43] The "error of the Jews" is "they thought Christ's kingdom should be temporal, which is the ground of all this vanity." The Puritans have adopted this "Jewish dream"; indeed, "these men. . . out-dream the Jews."[44]

Despite Laud's sermon, the "error of the Jews" spread. The left wing of the Puritan movement continued to proclaim themselves Jews in belief and practice according to Levitical law. Some determined individuals went abroad to study under continental rabbis and acquaint themselves with Talmudic law and literature. In 1647 the Long Parliament appropriated five hundred pounds to buy books "of a very great value, late brought out of Italy and having been the Library of a learned Rabbi there."[45] By the middle of the century, they agitated for a return of the Jews to England, an event guaranteed to usher in the Millennium. A certain widow from Brentford bid "Religion quite adieu," and "Turn'd from a Nonconformist to a Jew" because "If one affirm he learned it of a Jew,/the silly people think it must be true."[46] Thomas Hobbes was concerned that the discussion of the Sabbath would undermine morals because when the common man saw "the commandments to be *jus humanum* merely (as it must be, if the church can alter it) they will hope also that the other nine may be so too, for every man hitherto did believe that the ten commandments were the moral, that is an eternal, law."[47]

According to Rabbi Newman, "Jews promoted by their scholarly and literary contributions those tendencies towards rationalism which arose from within Christian groups; Jews were perpetual opponents of the conventional orthodoxies of the day, and sought to bring current beliefs into harmony with their special outlook and views."[48] In the 17th century, however, the opposite was true. Contact with the Jews tended to encourage Millennialist fervor, not "rationalism," among judaizing Christians. The converse was also true. Contact with 17th century millennialist sects like the Ranters, Diggers, Quakers, and Puritans, encouraged Millennialism among the Jews. Both movements were fueled by Luther's doctrine of *Sola Scriptura* and the corrupt translations of the Bible the Jews were churning out in collaboration with Protestants. Seventeenth-century England showed that when *Sola Scriptura* was combined with the natural bent of human passion, revolution was the invariable outcome. Give an Englishman the Bible and tell him he was now

empowered to interpret the Scriptures according to his own lights, and, one way or another, social anarchy followed as night from day. The English Catholics recognized this early, so they translated the Bible at Douay. In 1582, the translator, Gregory Martin, attacked "Jewes and Heretickes" as corrupters of texts and souls in his pamphlet, "Discoverie of the Manifold Corruptions of the Holy Scriptures by heretickes of our dais, especially the English sectaries." According to Martin,

> the ancient best learned Fathers and Doctours of the Church doe much complaine and testifie to us that both the Hebrew and Greeke editions are foully corrupted by Jewes and Heretikes, since the Latin was truly translated out of them, whiles they were more pure; and that the same Latin hath been farre better conserued from corruptions. So that the old Vulgate Latin Edition hath been preferred and used for most authentical about a thousand and three hundred years.[49] Calvin's Bible "contained misinterpretations, leading to a denial of the Divinity and Messiahship of Jesus, and thus favoring Arianism and Judaism."[50]

Forty years after Martin issued his warning, Englishmen as diverse as Laud and Hobbes admitted the *Sola Scriptura* chickens were coming home to roost. The Englishmen who grew up reading corrupted Bibles were now becoming Jews. "The fear," Rabbi Newman says, "even among Protestants, that vernacular Bible translations, based on the original Hebrew text, would lead to Judaism, is one of the important facts in a study of the history of Bible versions."[51] When Amsterdam became the refuge of the Jews, it became the refuge of every judaizing revolutionary sect too.

Amsterdam provided a haven not only for Jews and Calvinists; it became a magnet for fugitives from the medieval world. Like the Anabaptist commune in Muenster one hundred years earlier, Amsterdam attracted disaffected nuns and priests. Anyone unhappy with celibacy or the ban on usury could move to Amsterdam. One way to express discontent was to become a Jew. This was true of Catholics of Jewish descent from Spain and Portugal as well as of the Protestants from England. Becoming a Jew was not a reversion to a more ancient tradition, although it could be seen as that. Taking their cue from the Psalms, the medieval popes consistently referred to judaizers, who preferred the bondage of the law to the freedom of the Gospels, as dogs who returned to their vomit. Becoming a Jew was the opposite of a return to tradition because as deconverted Catholics soon discovered, there was no genuine tradition to return to. Tradition had to be created. Menasseh ben Israel's printing of Talmudic literature was a tacit acknowledgment of the self-contradiction that traditions had to be created.

Menasseh's most famous book, *Conciliador*, was not a reconciliation of Christian and Jewish texts, but a demonstration that Jewish texts preceded and therefore outranked what followed. Becoming a Jew was an act of conscious

rebellion against the Catholic Church and the medieval world it had created in Europe. Holland became the locus of this rebellion because it provided a new *modus vivendi* for Jews who wanted to throw off their Christianity, just as it provided a similar opportunity for Christians who wanted to live like Jews. The Jewish community in Amsterdam "expressed and incarnated the Hope of Israel,"[52] i.e., membership in a community which was more tangible and had more tangible benefits, a community which "would be the fount of all material and spiritual good."[53] Amsterdam had become a manifestation of what Archbishop Laud would call "the terrene kingdom of the Jewes," one more heaven on earth.

Shortly after Menasseh's birth, his family moved from the Madeira Islands to La Rochelle in France where, Roth says, "Outwardly, they continued to conform to the rites of the Church, while observing in the secrecy of their homes, with rather more confidence than hitherto, their ancestral religious practices."[54] Menasseh ben Israel was a baptized Catholic, as were John Calvin, Martin Luther, and Johan Bokelzoon. Like them, he hated the Church. "Baptism," according to the *Catechism of the Catholic Church,* "seals the Christian with an indelible spiritual mark of his belonging to Christ. No sin can erase this mark, even if sin prevents Baptism from bearing the fruits of salvation. Given once for all, Baptism cannot be repeated."[55] Becoming a Jew was similar to becoming a pagan in the post-Christian era, a phenomenon depressingly familiar in Europe during the 20th century. It was not a naive continuation of some ancient tradition, but rather a renunciation of Christ. The Sephardic Jew who came to Amsterdam to be circumcised was a revolutionary as much as the early reformers were revolutionaries. All had accepted Baptism as entrance into the Catholic Church; all lived lives in rebellion against that Church. Both the Jews and the Protestants known as Demi-Jews were creating their own *sui generis* traditions out of what they appropriated from the Old Testament. Jew and Reformer could cooperate politically because they shared a common project, the repudiation of the Church and the order she had impressed on Europe. Both Jew and Demi-Jew had a mainly negative identity: Talmudic Judaism and the Reformed faith were anti-Catholicism, created by people who had accepted (through their parents) the indelible mark of Baptism and who had been formed intellectually by Catholic faith and culture.

Menasseh lived 100 years after the first wave of "reform" in Europe. The Dutch Republic was a haven for those who hated Spain and what Spain stood for, namely, medieval Catholic Europe. The Low Countries had been a hotbed of revolutionary activity since the cloth industry began in Flanders. Prosperity, derived from the region's advanced agriculture, had created a surplus population which became dispossessed from the land and the rooted traditions there and found employment in the cities as weavers and dyers. By the end of the 13th century all of what is now Belgium and northeastern

France had become a single manufacturing district and "the most highly industrialized part of a predominantly agricultural continent."[36] The wealth the cloth industry created had a dual effect on the peasantry, which migrated from the land to the city. The city offered freedom from ancestral duties and restrictions. It also offered freedom from the customs under which those who valued freedom over duty chafed. It offered incentive to those with personal enterprise and imagination. But the spectacle of unheard-of wealth provoked, in Cohn's words, "a bitter sense of frustration"[37] too. Freedom cut both ways in the new industrial towns. There was a sense of release from ancestral burdens, but there was no protection from exploitation.

The rootless proletariat of the cloth industry was, as a result, vulnerable to millennialist revolutionary movements and ideologies. A group of people drawn "from the most impulsive and unstable elements in medieval society" was especially susceptible to "any kind of revolt or revolution." Messianic politics "acted on these people with peculiar sharpness and called for reactions of peculiar violence. And the way in which they attempted to deal with their common plight was to form a salvationist group under the leadership of some man whom they regarded as extraordinarily holy."[38] They or, more likely, their charismatic leader, would consult the Bible and come up with something apocalyptic based off the Books of Daniel and Revelation which promised a new heaven and a new earth that would be realized in carnal terms. Joachim of Fiore's three stages of history is one example. According to Joachim, the age of the Father, the Old Testament, was to be followed by the age of the Son, the New Testament, which was in turn to be followed by the age of the Holy Spirit, which became an empty vessel into which all manner of revolutionary content could be poured.

These movements were invariably Jewish in orientation. Indeed, the idea of revolution, the idea that a lowly people would be able to assert itself against the powerful, was only conceivable in light of biblical texts like Exodus. Israel's history was essentially a replay of Exodus, as the lowly Israelites triumphed after initial adversity over one empire after another. Eventually, the pattern was codified in the Book of Daniel, in the description of the four monarchies—the four beasts—the fourth being Rome. When Rome was defeated, the fifth monarchy would begin. That meant the advent of the millenium, a thousand year reign of peace on earth during which the rapacious feeding of the powerful on the lowly would cease, history would be reversed, and the lowly would reign in a kingdom of their own. "It is natural enough," Cohn says, "that the earliest of these prophecies should have been produced by Jews. What so sharply distinguished the Jews from the other peoples of the ancient world was their attitude towards history and in particular towards their own role in history."[39]

Natural or not, some questions remained. Most notably, what did Rome mean? Which Rome are we talking about? A Catholic millennialist could

claim the millenium coincided with the rise of the Catholic Church, which succeeded the Roman Empire and created a millennium of Christian civilization in Europe. But, as we have seen, by the Council of Ephesus the Church had disavowed associating the Kingdom of God with any earthly historical epoch. That insured that millennialism would have an anti-Catholic animus because it could flourish only in opposition to the Church. As a result, the fourth monarchy began to be seen not as the Roman Empire but as the Roman Catholic Church. One need only ascertain the date on which the Roman Church had succeeded the Roman Empire, add 1000 years, and the result would be a date close to the time of revolutionary turmoil in the middle of the 17th century. The more the turmoil increased, the more the people were driven to establish a precise date. The Jews settled on 1648 as the year of redemption, and when that date came and went without the advent of the messiah, they adopted the Christian date of 1666 for the dawn of the millenium.

The Jewish tradition of messianic politics that began when Annas and Caiaphas rejected Christ and culminated in the Simon bar Kokhba rebellion, which commenced in 131, was appropriated by 17th century Christians with similarly disastrous results. Beginning in the 16th century, the locus was the Low Countries, where the Jews expelled from Spain made contact with English Puritans, Dutch Calvinists, German Lutherans, and the remnant of the Anabaptists from Muenster. A political alliance arose between the revived millennialist proletarian revolutionary movement that haunted Flanders and the Rhineland during the Middle Ages and the dormant Jewish tradition of messianic politics. Ironically, the Rhenish revolutionary tradition was rabidly anti-Semitic. But anti-Catholic, too.

Menasseh ben Israel's genius, if we can call it that, lay in recognizing the times had changed. Menasseh was not a deep thinker, but he understood the Protestant revolt had created new possibilities for the Jews in Europe, and he was determined to exploit them. The advent of Protestantism meant a new sphere of influence for the Jews and the possibility of a new political and social configuration too.

Despite his insight and zeal, Menasseh did not prosper as a rabbi in Amsterdam. In 1639 when the two Amsterdam congregations merged, Menasseh ben Israel was passed over in the search for a head rabbi. "At present," he wrote in 1639 in *De Termino Vitae*, "in complete disregard of my personal dignity, I am engaged in trade. . . . What else is there for me to do? I have neither the wealth of a Croesus, nor the nature of a Thersites."[60] Significantly, Menasseh dedicated this book to the Dutch West India Company. He was deeply interested in trade with Brazil and was thinking of moving there. "No doubt," Gerhard Johann Vos wrote in January 1640 to Grotius, the great jurist, "he will act there as rabbi. . . his domestic affairs compel him to take this step; for he is far from affluent."[61]

Then, standing on the quay at the foot of the Joodenbreestraat contemplating moving to South America, Menasseh suddenly got more than he bargained for. Something strange happened. South America came to him.

On September 19, 1644, after years of importuning Portuguese travelers in the hope they might be secret Jews, Menasseh ben Israel met the wild-eyed marrano Antonio de Montezinos, or Aaron Levi, who had come with a tale the credulous rabbi found irresistible. Montezinos had just arrived from South America, where he had been imprisoned by the Inquisition on a charge of judaizing. In prison, Montezinos mulled over reports he had heard from the Indians for years concerning the religious practices of tribes near Quito. Unable to expel the rumors from his mind, Montezinos made a solemn vow to the God of Israel that if he ever regained freedom he would investigate them. Appparently God heard Montezinos' prayer because he was soon released and on his way to meet the tribe under the guidance of a local cacique. Once out of the reach of the Inquisition, the Indian chief made a startling revelation. He was a Jew of the tribe of Levi. What the rest of the world thought were benighted savages living in the jungles of South America were in reality the Ten Lost Tribes of Israel!

It was a moment worthy of the scene in *Blazing Saddles* where Mel Brooks has an Indian speak Yiddish, but the credulous rabbi believed every word of Montezinos' story. Beyond that, he feverishly deduced the theological consequences of this startling revelation. The messiah, he knew, could only come when Jews had reached the "ends of the earth," a word rendered in Hebrew as "*Kezeh ha-Arez*," a literal and erroneous translation of the French word for England, "*Angle-Terre*." Since "*Kezeh*" meant both "angle" and "limit," England was known as the "ends of the earth" to medieval Jewish writers. Since the Ten Lost Tribes were in America, they were spread all over the earth, except for one land, England. If the Jews could get to England, then they would have spread to the ends of the earth, and the messiah was bound to appear. It was hard to argue with evidence this convincing, especially since Montezinos swore a solemn oath that what he revealed was true. If true, then the theological insights the unerringly logical Menasseh derived were equally true. All Menasseh ben Israel needed to do was get the Jews readmitted to England. God would take care of the rest. So the portly rabbi embarked upon the great project of his life.

ENGLAND TEACHES MEN HOW TO LIVE HEAVEN ON EARTH

After years of watching his predecessor try to deal with the Puritan revolutionaries with weapons of the spirit, Charles I ran out of patience and decided to resort to weapons of a more mundane sort. On August 22, 1642, he threw down the gauntlet at Nottingham and led his army to war against the

Puritans. His opponent was a man who had no previous military experience but was a military genius nonetheless who would change the face of warfare just as Zizka had done in Bohemia two centuries before. The name of the English Zizka was Oliver Cromwell, and from the moment he took command of the Puritan cavalry at the Battle of Marston Moor in 1644, the tide of war turned against the king, eventuating in his ultimate defeat and capture one year later. Unlike Zizka, who devised an ingenious defense against the cavalry charge, Cromwell refined the cavalry charge as a weapon of exceptional offensive power, one that lasted for almost three hundred years, to be eclipsed only in the 20th century by the deployment of the machine gun.

Cromwell was born in Huntingdon in 1599. His family name would have been Williams but his great-great-grandfather married the sister of Thomas Cromwell, one of Henry VIII's most powerful councilors, and then adopted the name of his wife's family to access that power. Like the Cecils and the Russells, the wealth and power of the Cromwells came from looting the Catholic Church. "The Cromwells," a biographer writes, "were a large and locally influential family, who had risen rapidly during the 16th century and had acquired wealth and extensive property, much of it formerly belonging to the Catholic Church but disposed of in the wake of the Henrician Reformation."[62] Since Oliver grew up in a house once owned by a Catholic monastic order, he was daily reminded of where his family wealth came from and who his ancestral enemies were. In 1628, Oliver took a seat in Parliament, where he represented the Puritan cause. Also in 1628, he began a life-long battle with mental illness. Cromwell's personality was the unstable combination of melancholic and choleric humors that modern medicine calls bipolar disorder. Cromwell was a manic depressive; in 1628, his physician, Sir Theodore Mayern, treated the symptoms of "*valde melancholicus*," by prescribing what Cromwell's biographer called "a wonderful cocktail of drugs."[63] Ten years after diagnosis as a manic depressive, Cromwell had a religious experience which gave religious justification to his mood swings. In the same year he was accused of judaizing by a fellow member of parliament. Then civil war broke out.

The civil war brought in its wake famine, pestilence, and, worst of all, Puritan pamphlets justifying revolution by appealing to the Old Testament. In 1642 Henry Archer brought forth an idea that would result in the spilling of barrels of ink and the slaying of thousands of trees over the next few centuries. In *The Personal Reign of Christ on Earth*, Archer used the Books of Daniel and Revelation to explain the contemporary political situation. Numerous Protestants would follow his example. Sometimes the contemporary political situation was used to explicate Daniel and Revelation. Archer's book became the intellectual justification for a political movement known as the Fifth Monarchy Men. As the name implies, the challenge at the heart of their movement involved discovering when the fourth monarchy described in the

Book of Daniel had ended. If Archer had read history with an open mind, he might speculatively have concluded the thousand year reign of Christ on earth began with the Alaric's sacking of Rome in 410 and ended when the age of revolution began with the excommunication of John Huss. But that theory would have made the millennium coterminous with the Church of Rome, something that could not be true because he had already declared the "fearfull Little Horne," which came up among them was the Papacy.[64] Since the Book of Daniel had to be twisted to justify the rebellion in England, Rome had to be construed as the Church of Rome. "The great question" then became "when the ten kingdoms and Papacy began in Europe?"[65] By adding 1260 to the year 406 (when Archer claims the papacy began), Archer got the year 1666, as both the limit of the papacy's duration and the number of the beast (actually 666) proposed by the Book of Revelation. This correspondence could not be coincidence, Archer reasoned, and so the thousand year reign of Christ on earth would begin in a mere 24 years. That meant, of course, that the conversion of the Jews was imminent, which meant the ten lost tribes were already massing on the other side of the river that flowed every day of the week but Saturday in preparation for their march on Jerusalem. One commentator describes Archer's scriptural scholarship as part of "the lengthy and laborious efforts of the sect to interpret the Bible in accordance with their preconceived ideas."[66] Those labors involved the conversion of the Jews and "resulted in many Fifth Monarchy Men developing strong Hebraic tendencies and sympathies."[67]

Any lingering doubt that Puritanism was a combination of *Sola Scriptura*-based proof texting and appetite was removed in August 1643 with publication of John Milton's tract on *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce.* Milton was the heir of the Puritan occultism spawned by the magician John Dee and nourished by the Earl of Leicester and his nephew Philip Sidney, which achieved its first literary expression in the *Faerie Queene.* Milton was an admirer of Spenser, and from Milton's pen flowed the second great Protestant epic, the one with Satan as its "hero," *Paradise Lost.* "Milton's vision for England," according to Frances Yates, "was that of a nation of chosen people, chosen in the Hebraic sense, chosen to lead Protestant Europe against the power of the Papal Antichrist. Spenser had envisaged Elizabethan England and its queen as chosen for just such a religious role. The great difference was, of course, that Milton was not a monarchist, like Spenser, but a republican."[68] Spenser and Milton shared an unfortunate theology, a genuine gift at versification, and an exquisitely poor sense of timing. Spenser published the *Faerie Queene* one year after John Dee had returned in disgrace from his failed mission to Prague. Consequently, Spenser, like Dee, found no support for his imperialist propaganda at court. Similarly, Milton brought out his apologia for revolution and regicide six years after the collapse of the Puritan commonwealth, at the

height of the Restoration, when the rage against Cromwell was so high that a mob dug up his corpse and hanged it.

Milton admired Spenser "whom," Yates tells us, "he held to be a better teacher than Aquinas."[69] Milton derived the Hebraic elements in *Paradise Lost* not directly from the Zohar or the Talmud but indirectly through the *Faerie Queene* and from Robert Fludd and Rosicrucianism, which would also become a source for freemasonry. When the "Rosicrucian movement had failed on the continent," Yates says, "Refugees from that failure poured into Puritan England as the refuge from the Antichrist. And the Puritan revolution took over some of the aspects of the projected Rosicrucian revolution. That is why there was a 'Puritan Occultism,' why an English translation of the Rosicrucian manifestos was published in Cromwellian England, and why the philosophy of John Dee was cultivated by earnest Parliamentarians."[70]

Frances Yates shows how the trajectory of judaizing which began with Dee's infatuation with magic and Cabala led to Cromwell and Milton's justification of revolution. Missing from her account, though, is the crucial role played by sexual appetite. Revolution was a binary weapon, which could be driven by appetite and the rationalization of appetite that thinkers could derive from *Sola Scriptura* and the ransacking of the Old Testament for proof texts.

In 1642 John Milton, then 34 years old, married Mary Powell, daughter of Richard Powell, a justice of peace. The Powells, adherents of the Cavalier party who had a lively social life, seem not to have thought out the consequences of having their daughter marry the Puritan *Penseroso*. Within a month, Mary tired of the "philosophic life (after having been used to a great house, and much company and joviality)"[71] and returned to her parents. Milton "sent for her by letter,"[72] but the letters went unanswered. The Powell family, "being generally addicted to the cavalier party,"[73] had second thoughts. They considered their new son-in-law and his radical opinions "a blot in their escutcheon,"[74] especially since it seemed Charles would soon dispatch the rebel armies and re-establish his court. Finally, Milton dispatched a messenger ordering his wife to return, but the messenger came back alone, "dismissed with some sort of contempt."[75]

In the meantime, the Puritan *Penseroso* fell in love with another woman, "one of Dr. Davis's daughters, a very handsome and witty gentlewoman," who was "averse" to marrying a married man.[76] With his sexual desires thwarted twice, Milton resolved the matter in typically Puritan fashion, ransacking the Bible for a justification for divorce that would enable him to marry Miss Davis. Milton "forthwith prepared to fortify himself with arguments for such a resolution, and accordingly wrote two treatises, by which he understood that it was against reason, and the enjoinment of it *not provable by Scripture*, for any married couple disagreeable in humor and temper, or having an aversion to each other, to be forced to live yoked together all their days."[77] The first result of the decision to dump his wife and replace her with Miss Davis was *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*; the second was *Tetrachordon*.

Justification of divorce was a tall order for a Christian whose first principle was *Sola Scriptura* because, as anyone who has read the Gospel knows, Christ specifically prohibited divorce. The project would have been impossible were it not for the Puritan tendency to Judaize, which emanated from the penumbra of *Sola Scriptura*. This worked in two ways. First, *Sola Scriptura* relativized the priority of the New Testament over the Old. The New Testament was no longer the fulfillment of the Old nor was it the only lens through which the Old could be seen and interpreted properly. *Sola Scriptura* tended to democratize the books of the Bible, which, since there were many more books in the Old Testament than in the New, tended to lead to the Old Testament's priority over the New. *Sola Scriptura* thus led to judaizing. Secondly, judaizing led to Talmudic exegesis, which is to say, a devaluation of the actual text in favor of the opinions of rabbis. Milton was a very learned rabbi, and without the Church to protect it, the Bible succumbed to the hammer blows of what looked like Milton's libido-driven "logic." His biographer presents the moral and psychological dynamics of his decision straightforwardly. Since Milton was "then in the full vigor of his manhood," and "could ill bear the disappointment he met with by her obstinate absenting," he justified divorce, so "that he might be free to marry another; concerning which he also was in treaty."[78]

The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce became a classic in the canon of sophistry, and remained a beacon for sophists for centuries. (Stanley Fish began his career in literary criticism as a Milton scholar.) Milton's justification of divorce would have been unthinkable without Puritanism's prior commitment to judaizing. "It follows now," Milton says, "that those places of scripture which have a seeming to revoke the prudence of Moses, or rather that merciful decree of God, be forthwith explained and reconciled. For what are all these reasonings worth, will some reply, whenas the words of Christ are plainly against all divorce, 'except in case of fornication' Matt 5: 32."[79] The relativization of Christ's prohibition of divorce could only proceed by placing Moses on the same level as Christ. This completely heretical notion, contradicted by the Gospel of St. John, was no hindrance to a devotee of *Sola Scriptura*, which, it appears, had become another word for appetite. In other words, "the necessity of justifying himself" now coincided with "a point of so great concern to the peace and preservation of families, and so likely to prevent temptations as well as mischiefs."[80]

There was a public aspect to Milton's personal problems. Parliament was debating the legalization of divorce during the time of Mary's absence. "Doubt not, worthy senators," Milton wrote, "to vindicate the sacred honor and judgment of Moses your predecessor, from the shallow commenting of scholastics and canonists."[81] Mary's departure was thus a chance to make a virtue of necessity. Extrapolating from his own situation, as Luther had done in *De servo arbitrio*, Milton could guide England's legislature, which then

would become a beacon for the world. All Milton had to do was "show . . . that our Saviour, in those four places of the Evangelists, meant not the abrogating [of divorce] but rectifying the abuses of it."[82]

The key to this alchemical transmutation of Christ's words was the false dichotomy Moses-Christ that judaizing had enabled. Moses is proposed as "an author great beyond exception."[83] Milton could not denigrate Christ, but he could nullify his teaching by claiming "our Savior's words touching divorce" had been "congealed into a stony rigor, inconsistent both with his doctrine and his office."[84] What culminated as the special pleading that would give theologians a bad reputation in the latter half of the 20th century as shills for appetite and special interest began in England with judaizing politics. The attraction of judaizing was immediately apparent. Moses could be portrayed as permitting what Christ prohibited. Since Moses was the lawgiver for the nation of Israel, England's solons should follow his example and promote "expedient liberty."[85] In doing this, they "shall restore the much wronged and over-sorrowed state of matrimony, *not only to those merciful and life-giving remedies of Moses*, but as much as may be, to that serene and blissful condition it was in at the beginning and shall deserve of all apprehensive men. . . they shall deserve to be reckoned among the public benefactors of civil and human life above the inventors of wine and oil; for this is far dearer, far nobler and more desirable and cherishing to man's life unworthily exposed to sadness and mistake which they shall vindicate."[86] Milton again needs to contradict Christ and scripture, because Christ said "in the beginning it was not so," meaning that divorce was something added after the fall because Moses had to deal with the hardness of his people's hearts.

As if conceding the subversion of Christ's own words is a lost cause as long as the New Testament has priority over the Old, Milton appeals first to the reformers and then to the rabbis to bolster his argument:

> Yea, God himself commands in his law more than once, and by his prophet Malachi, as Calvin and the best translations read that "he who hates, let him divorce—that is, he who hates cannot love. Hence it is that the rabbins, and Maimonides, famous among the rest, in a book of his set forth by Buxtorfius, tells us that "divorce was permitted by Moses to preserve peace in marriage and quiet in the family."[87]

The English Parliament should take the Jews as their model, because

> Surely the Jews had their saving peace about them as well as we, yet care was taken that this wholesome provision for household peace should also be allowed them: and must this be denied to Christians? O perverseness! that the law should be made more provident of peacemaking than the gospel! that the gospel should be put to beg a necessary help of mercy from the law, but must not have it! and that to grind in the mill of an undelighted and servile copulation must be the only forced work of a

> Christian marriage, ofttimes with such a yoke-fellow, from whom both love and peace, both nature and religion, mourns to be separated.[88]

The logic is inexorable. As we have seen, if the New Testament no longer has hegemony over the Old and if the words of Christ can be relativized by the testimony of rabbis, then in what sense are Milton and the Puritans Christians? Urged on by libido to plead for divorce, Milton willingly abandons Christianity to gratify his appetites, proving Laud and the Catholics were right in their verdict against the Puritans: The Puritans were Jews, and their piety was a front for rationalized misbehavior.

Eventually politics solved Milton's marital problems. "The declining state of the King's cause" along with the very handsome and witty Miss Davis waiting in the wings, convinced the Powell family that it might not be so bad to have a Puritan son-in-law, so they "set all engines to work to restore the late married woman to the station wherein they a little before had planted her."[89] Mary "of her own accord came, and submitted to him, pleading that her mother had been the inciter of her to that frowardness."[90] The story had a happy ending. The couple reconciled, and a daughter was conceived as "the first fruits of her return to her husband."[91]

Before long Milton's marital problems were swept up in the messianic politics at the heart of Puritan-Jewish revolutionary thought. England's legalization of divorce provided the world with a "magnanimous example" which "will easily spread far beyond the banks of Tweed and the Norman isles."[92] England as the new Israel has a mission to save the world, a mission that was later adopted by messianic American descendants of Jews and Puritans. "It would not be the first or second time," the author of *Paradise Lost* continues,

> since our ancient druids, by whom this island was the cathedral of philosophy to France, left off their pagan rites, that England hath had this honor vouchsafed from heaven, to give out reformation to the world. Who was it but our English Constantine that baptized the Roman Empire? Who but the Northumbrian Willibrorde and Winifride of Devon, with their followers were the first apostles of Germany? Who but Alcuin and Wycliffe our countrymen, opened the eyes of Europe, the one in arts, the other in religion? *Let not England forget her precedence of teaching nations how to live.*[93]

In Milton's tendentious pleading for legalization of divorce, one can almost hear the devotees of Planned Parenthood arguing the logical sequel to America's conquest of Afghanistan or Iraq should be contraception and abortion there. Messianic politics and sexual liberation have gone hand in hand from the beginning, and it seems they still do, now that America is the uncontested new Israel. Messianic politics cannot function without Old Testament models.

Puritans and Jews shared a desire to attain the spiritual goods promised in the Bible by secular means. Messianic politics was a form of magic; the attainment of wealth and power by spiritual means had always been the goal of Simon Magus and his followers. It appealed powerfully to people who, full of revulsion at the Cross of Christ and the ideal of suffering it embodied, were discovering the natural sciences. "It is better," St. Augustine wrote, summarizing the Catholic alternative to Simon Magus, "to love God and make use of money, than to love money and make use of God."[94] The Puritan rejection of the medieval worldview of the Catholic Church is ultimately traceable to the Jewish rejection of the suffering Christ as an unworthy Messiah. "The chief priests," St. Matthew tells us, "with the scribes and elders mocked him in the same way. 'He saved others,' they said, 'he cannot save himself. He is the king of Israel; let him come down from the Cross now, and we will believe in him [27:42]."

The Jewish/Puritan alliance was born in a rejection of the Cross and all it stood for, and the substitution of King David or Simon bar Kokhba or Shabbetai Zevi or Oliver Cromwell or Napoleon Bonaparte as an alternative to the suffering Christ. Cromwell, as Graetz points out, was driven to consummate this revolutionary alliance between Jews and Puritans on the theoretical and practical levels:

> To bury oneself in the history, prophecy, and poetry of the Old Testament, to revere them as divine inspiration, to live in them with every emotion, yet not to consider the people who had originated all this glory and greatness as preferred and chosen was impossible. Among the Puritans, therefore, were many earnest admirers of "God's people" and Cromwell was one of them.[95]

The consummation of this revolutionary alliance against the Catholic Church and Catholic countries involved, in other words, not only rummaging through the Bible for images that would justify divorce or regicide, it also entailed bringing Jews into the land governed by the Puritan saints. According to Graetz:

> A desire was excited in the hearts of the Puritans to see this living wonder, the Jewish people, with their own eyes, to bring Jews to England, and, by making them part of the theocratic community about to be established, stamp it with the seal of completion. The sentiments of the Puritans towards the Jews were expressed in Oliver Cromwell's observation, "Great is my sympathy with this poor people, whom God chose and to whom He gave His law; it rejects Jesus because it does not recognize him as the Messiah." Cromwell dreamt of a reconciliation of the Old and New Testament, of an intimate connection between the Jewish people of God and the English Puritan theocracy. But other Puritans were so absorbed in the Old Testament that the New Testament was of no importance.

> Especially the visionaries in Cromwell's army and among the members of Parliament, who were hoping for the Fifth Monarchy, or the reign of the saints, assigned to the Jewish people a glorious position in the expected millennium. A Puritan preacher, Nathaniel Holmes . . . wished . . . to become the servant of Israel and serve him on bended knees. The more the tension in Israel increased . . . the more public life and religious thought assumed Jewish coloring. The only thing wanting to make one think himself in Judea was for the orators in Parliament to speak Hebrew.[96]

Cromwell's followers felt that by readmitting the Jews to England they could bring about the second coming of Christ, the millennium, and the fifth monarchy. In short, the middle of the 17th century was suffused with an apocalyptic vision of the establishment of Christ's kingdom in the here and now. Jewish refugees from Spain and English Ranters and Fifth Monarchy Men were of one mind: The Kingdom of God was at hand. Something like this had been held by Christians for over a millennium and a half, probably because its advent had been pronounced by Christ himself. What had changed, though, was the kind of kingdom Christ's followers were supposed to expect.

As we saw earlier, St. Augustine gave the definitive Catholic explication of the Book of Revelation in the *City of God*, where he explained the millennium was a spiritual allegory concerning an essentially spiritual reality. The millennium had begun with the death of Christ, and the New Jerusalem was fully realized in the Catholic Church. Augustine's explanation became Church doctrine when it was adopted as definitive by the Council of Ephesus in 431. From then, belief in the millennium as a worldly kingdom was dismissed as a superstitious aberration, "the error of the Jews."

As Archbishop Laud made clear, the Puritans were bent on resurrecting this "error of the Jews." Heaven on earth was to be instituted by a government of English saints in the decade following 1650. Since one of the inaugural events was the murder of the English king, it promised to be a bloody kingdom for those with eyes capable of seeing its true lineaments, but a worldly kingdom nonetheless, in which sainthood was the first job requirement of every politician.

There had been no Jews in England since 1290, at least officially, so English philo-Semitism had a distinctly utopian cast. English judaizers tended to idealize Jews according to their own idiosyncratic reading of the Old Testament. They did not evaluate Jews through empirical observation, at least not at the dawn of the messianic era in 1648. If they had been less preoccupied with their own revolution, the English could have learned something about Christian-Jewish relations by observing the apocalypse brewing in Poland as the English were debating the fate of their king. An objective study of what had happened in Spain might have been helpful too, but an objective English study of anything Spanish is the historical equivalent of an oxymoron.

In June 1645, Oliver Cromwell, in command of the revolutionary New Model Army, defeated the king's troops at Naseby, ending the civil war in England. In reviewing papers captured from the king's baggage, Cromwell discovered Charles had planned to recruit Irish Catholic troops by granting them religious concessions. That discovery did not bode well for the Irish or the king.

THE POLISH OLIGARCHY AND ITS EXPANSION

According to the Zohar, 1648 was to be the mystical year of resurrection, when the Jews could expect deliverance from their more than millennium long exile. Heinrich Graetz called the Zohar "that lying book" and used that prediction to impugn the entire cabalistic tradition. Since the Enlightenment was in some ways a result of the disappointment over the failure of the messianic expectations in the second half of the 17th century, his skepticism is understandable, as is his scorn for the Cabala, the mish-mash of what he considered Gnostic and Talmudic mumbo-jumbo that had led to the rise and fall of messianic hope. Graetz espoused a worldview that was the antithesis of the messianic fever of the mid-17th century. He was convinced in his opposition to the Cabala because he had the benefit of historical hindsight and could see where its vaporous illusions had led the Jewish people. Expectation of redemption fostered by widespread dissemination of cabalistic doctrine made the Jews, in Graetz's words, "more reckless and careless than was their custom at other times."[97]

Just what Graetz meant by reckless can be seen in his analysis of Polish Jewry, a hotbed of cabalistic thought. Beginning with the Statute of Kalisz in 1251, the Jews of Poland were granted rights unlike anywhere else in Europe. They were even granted their own autonomous legal system, the Kahal, which allowed them to adjudicate intra-Jewish disputes without recourse to the Polish Christian legal system. This autonomy necessitated intensive study of the Talmud, which, according to Graetz, led to the peculiar corruption of Polish Jews. The reliance on the Talmud created a culture of "hair-splitting judgment" among rabbis, says Graetz, as well as "a love of twisting, distorting, ingenious quibbling, and a foregone antipathy to what did not lie within their field of vision," which trickled down to the behavior of the vulgar, who "found pleasure and a sort of triumphant delight in deception and cheating."[98] By the end of the 18th century, the overwhelming majority of Jews lived in Poland, so Jews earned the reputation of being "a nation of deceivers," in Immanuel Kant's formulation. "It does indeed seem strange," Kant, the quintessential Enlightenment philosopher, continued, "to conceive of a nation of deceivers, but it is also very strange to conceive of a nation of merchants, the majority of whom, bound by an ancient superstition accepted by the state they live in, do not seek any civil dignity, but prefer to make good this disadvantage with

the benefits of trickery at the expense of the people who shelter them and at the expense of each other. In a nation of merchants, unproductive members of society. . . it cannot be otherwise."[99] From his vantage point in Koenigsberg, the capital of East Prussia, a country that the Teutonic Knights wrested by force from the Slavic natives, all Jews were Polish Jews.

Graetz, the Enlightenment Jew and apostle of German culture and Jewish assimilation to it, echoed Kant but confined his censure to the Jews of Poland, who, according to his judgment, "acquired the quibbling method of the schools and employed it to outwit the less cunning."[100] Piety and knowledge of the hair-splitting distinctions of the Talmud became one and the same for the Polish Jew, a combination which, when added to the dogmatism of the rabbis, "undermined their moral sense" and made them prone to "sophistry and boastfulness."[101]

Largely as a result of the concessions of the Polish crown which began with the Statute of Kalisz, Poland became known throughout Europe as the "*paradisus Judeorum*," the paradise of the Jews. When persecutions would flare up in traditionally Jewish sections of Europe like the German principalities, the Jews who wished to escape persecution inevitably headed east toward Poland, taking their language, "*juedische Deutsch*," or Yiddish, with them. When Isaac Bashevis Singer won the Nobel Prize toward the end of the 20th century, he was designated a Pole by the selection committee in spite of his candid admission that he understood Polish only with difficulty, even though he lived his entire youth in Poland. Jews did not assimilate in Poland; most did not learn the language of the Christian Poles, because, other than rudimentary commerce and illicit sexual activity, the Jews had no contact with them. The Jews established their own state within a state; they established their own legal system and courts, and, based on demographic evidence, the Polish paradise was the most successful *modus vivendi* Jews found in the West.

Between 1340 and 1772, at which point Poland was partitioned for the first time, the Jewish population of Poland increased 75-fold while the Christian population quintupled. The disparity in population increase is explainable in simple terms. Persecution in the west from the 11th to the 16th century caused massive immigration. Jews moved to Polish territory during that period in unprecedented numbers. By the time Poland was partitioned for the third time in 1795, 80 percent of the world's Jews lived there.

This phenomenal expansion of the Jewish population in Poland was matched by a correspondingly rapid increase in wealth that in turn corresponded to a dramatic expansion of the territorial limits of Poland. The Golden Age of Polish Jews, according to Pogonowski, lasted from 1500 to 1648.[102] By 1634, Poland was the largest country in Europe. Its territory extended from the Baltic almost to the Black Sea and from Silesia in the west to the heart of the Ukraine. By the middle of the 17th century, as much as 60 percent of Poland's

population was not ethnically Polish, a situation bound to cause friction, depending on how wisely the Polish rulers treated their ethnic subjects.

What followed was a classical case of cultural drift in which imperial expansion covered over internal decay until the contradictions and injustices became so insupportable that the bubble burst, and an orgy of violence followed, dragging the Polish state to extinction. The story of Poland was the story of Imperial Rome writ small. Imperial expansion to the east into what is now the Ukraine, the Crimea, and Belarus resulted in creation of huge estates, some the size of Holland and Switzerland. The estates were called Latifundia, an ironic comment on the blindness of the Polish nobility, who failed to see the mischief the Latifundia system had wrought in ancient Rome. The Polish nobles' republic was a classic oligarchy, as Plato defined the term in his *Republic*. As in ancient Greece, so in Poland: wealth concentrated in fewer and fewer hands led to rebellion among the lower classes. Wealth concentrated in fewer and fewer hands fueled imperialism in which the chief losers were the overwhelming majority of the Polish people. As in ancient Rome, the citizen soldiers were driven to the wall by the monopoly conditions the Latifundia fostered. When the rebellion came, all Poles would be held responsible for the excesses of the magnates who created the system that dispossessed the average Polish citizen.

The citizen soldiers who had been the backbone of the republic's legions became the disenfranchised rural proletariat once wealth was concentrated in the hands of the magnates. "The citizen-soldiers who owned small and medium estates," Pogonowski says, "suffered numerous bankruptcies and were becoming landless while still retaining their full civil rights and privileges." As a result, "many of them had to seek employment in the huge estates called Latifundia."[103] This meant more and more political power migrated to the land magnates, who now employed the enfranchised. As a result, "the political machines of the owners of the Latifundia enabled them to attain an oligarchic control of the politics of Poland. Their control of the national parliament was based on their grip on the provincial legislatures."[104]

In 1633, the Sejm passed a law forbidding Poland's nobility from selling liquor or engaging in commercial activities. The Polish nobility retained, as a result, political control of the country, but lost economic control. Because the Polish magnates owned the land but were unable to engage in commerce, they handed over income extraction to the Jews, who paid a set fee for a lease to raise the money the nobles needed. The system of pre-paid, short-term leases was known as "*arenda*." The connection between arenda tax-farming and the Jews was so intimate that it eventually was expressed in the Polish language. In legal contracts in the 17th and 18th century, the Polish word "*arendarz*," or tax-farmer, and "Jew" are synonymous. According to Pogonowski, "15 percent of urban and 80 percent of rural Jewish heads of households were occupied within the arenda system."[105]

The Jewish legal system, or kahal, brokered these licenses to well-to-do Jews, who in turn often subleased them to less well-to-do relatives. In Polish private law, *arenda* was defined as "the leasing of immovable property or rights. The subject of the lease might be a whole territory, held either in ownership or in pledge [or] the subject might be a tavern, mill or the right to collect various payments such as a bridge toll or a payment connected with a jurisdiction."[106] A Jew, for example, might take out a short-term lease on a church, in defiance of Church law. This meant he was in sole possession of the key to the church door, which could only be opened for weddings or baptisms after payment of a fee, a practice that led to resentment among Christians. Since the lease was short-term, the Jew would charge as much as he could to recoup his investment and some profit, since the lease might not be renewed. Or, if it were renewed, someone might outbid him. There was no financial incentive to create good will among the local population from which the arendar made his money. The Jewish tax-farmers had the support of the state—Pogonowski estimates 20 to 70 percent of the income of the large estates was generated by tax-farming leases held by Jews—but lacked the good will of the community. Since the Jew was not a part of that community, and had developed, as Graetz indicates, a whole culture treating the *goyim* with contempt, he could exploit the system well beyond what would have been tolerable had Catholic Poles run the system:

> Arenda-type short-term leases resulted in intensive exploitation of the leased estates, as the leasees tended to overwork the land, peasants and equipment without worrying about long-term effects. The peasants experienced additional hardships when Jewish arendars obtained the right to collect and even impose taxes and fees for church services. The peasants and Cossacks in Kresy [the newly colonized lands of the east] bitterly resented having to pay Jews for the use of Eastern Orthodox and Greek-Catholic churches for funerals, baptism, weddings and other similar occasions.[107]

Because of the arenda system and the prohibition against nobles distilling spirits, the Jews assumed control of the liquor business. They could manipulate the price of grain by diverting it to more profitable use as distilled spirits. They also intensely promoted alcohol consumption to maximize profits during the short term of the lease. This led to chronic drunkenness, decreased productivity, and increased resentment against Jews, who were perceived as constantly seeking to exploit the weaknesses of the majority to enhance their own wealth and power.

Graetz talks about the Jew who was experienced in financial matters as a salutary counterbalance to the impetuous, headstrong, and ultimately child-like Polish nobleman:

> The high nobility continued to be dependent on Jews, who in a measure counterbalanced the national defects. Polish flightiness, levity, unsteadiness, extravagance and recklessness were compensated for by Jewish prudence, sagacity, economy and cautiousness. The Jew was more than a financier to the Polish nobleman; he was his help in embarrassment, his prudent adviser, his all in all.[108]

There are other ways of viewing the "unique utilitarian alliance. . . between the huge landowners and the Jewish financial elite."[109] Looked at one way, Jewish migration to Poland brought Jewish capital that was soon put at the disposal of the Polish crown and the landowning magnates, whose estates expanded dramatically. The Polish magnates then used the Jews and their money to expand the Polish empire into the fertile steppes of the Ukraine, Belarus, and the northern shore of the Black Sea. Looked at another way, this alliance concentrated the wealth into fewer and fewer hands, especially during the Jewish colonization in the Ukraine in the 80 years between 1569 and 1648. Since the leases involved monopoly rights, the Jewish tax-farmers could increase the political power of their wealthy patrons, and their own wealth and influence as well, by driving the smaller independent landowners to the wall. The short term increase in power, though, increased the magnitude and violence of the reaction when it came. The success of the new system contained within in it the seeds of its destruction.

The radical disjunction between political and economic power meant the enfranchised noble citizens gradually lost control of their culture. The easy-going Polish oligarchs, wedded to an economic system that seemed so successful in bringing new lands under the Polish crown, did not understand control over those territories was undermined from within by the very people that administered it. This happened gradually, of course, and it manifested itself first in religion. Flush with the short-term wealth which the arenda system created and the territorial expansion which it enabled, the Polish kings ignored the biggest cultural crisis of their day, the Protestant revolt against Catholic hegemony over Europe. Because there was no Inquisition in Poland, Poland became a model for tolerance, paving the way for its own extinction.

While the Duke of Parma was battling Calvinists and Jews in the Netherlands and setting up a barrier beyond which the Reformation would not pass, helping to save southern Europe from the rebellion which had devastated England and the North, Sigismund August II, ruler of Poland and Lithuania, surrounded himself with Jews and the Protestant revolutionaries the Poles called Demi-Jews. The "Reformers" in Poland were largely Unitarian and Socinian followers of Michael Servetus, who, in Graetz's words, "Undermined the foundations of Christianity," by "rejecting the veneration of Jesus as a divine person."[110]

Flush with the money they provided, King Sigismund indulged his disordered passions and handed the country over to Jewish and Demi-Jewish administrators to rule as they wished. Peasants groaned under the predations of the Jewish tax-farmers, who in turn lent money to the king at less usurious interest rates, keeping him under their power too. Rabbi Mendel Frank of Brest, says Walsh, "was so influential that he was called the King's Officer."[111] As in England, the Polish nobles were torn between religious principle and economic interest. As in England, economic considerations won out and "the nobility in most cases held its protecting hand over the Jews to whom it was tied by the community of economic interests."[112] The Polish oligarchs "were either in debt to the Jews, or employed them to squeeze taxes for them out of the peasants, naturally at a good profit for the tax-farmers, who took their toll from dairies, mills, distilleries, farms."[113] The Jews "were indispensable to the easy-going magnate, who was wont to let his estates take care of themselves and wile away his time at the capital, at the court, in merry amusements, or at the tumultuous sessions of the national and provincial assemblies, where politics was looked upon as a form of entertainment rather than as a serious pursuit. This Polish aristocracy put a check on the anti-Semitic endeavors of the clergy."[114] The Jesuits warred with the Jews over the mind of the Polish oligarchs, but there was no Inquisition and no Counter Reformation in Poland. As a result, Calvinism, Socinianism, and Unitarianism spread among the nobles unchecked by official Catholic resistance. So Poland became, in Graetz's words, "a second Babylon for the Jews."[115]

By the death of Sigismund II in 1572, the Jews had attained enough power to name his successor in collaboration with the Porte in Constantinople, the Huguenots in France, and the English Protestants. Solomon ben Nathan Ashkenazi, although sponsor to the Duke of Ferrara was involved in negotiations regarding a later king. Solomon Ashkenazi was a German Jew who had migrated to the paradise of the Jews, where he eventually became chief physician to King Sigismund. He eventually migrated to Constantinople, where he served the Sultan as faithfully as he had served the Polish king. Solomon Ashkenazi succeeded Joseph Nasi, also an adviser to the sultan, as "a sort of unofficial leader of world Jewry."[116] Like Nasi, Ashkenazi orchestrated events from behind the scenes. "Christian cabinets," Graetz says, "did not suspect that the course of events which compelled them to side with one party or the other was set in motion by a Jewish hand. This was especially so in the case of the election of the Polish king."[117]

Locked into such a profitable alliance with the Jews, the Polish magnates saw little reason to change a system from which they profited so effortlessly and enormously. As a result the exactions of the Jewish tax-farmers became onerous to the point of being intolerable among the peasantry in general, but especially among the newly colonized Cossacks, who never felt themselves a part of the Polish nation or, as Orthodox, part of the Catholic culture of the

West. The political crisis, which had been growing during the last 80 years of Polish imperial expansion, corresponded as well to the worst excesses of the arenda system. Reform of the system was urgently necessary, and a bill of reform eventually made its way to the Sejm.

In 1647, as one precondition that prepared for a Polish crusade against the Ottoman Empire, the Cossacks were promised full civil rights and enfranchisement over time as Polish citizens. That meant "the harsh exploitation by Jewish holders of short time leases was to be lessened by banning the collection of such payments as church fees for funerals, weddings, baptisms, etc."[118] It also meant disobedience to the tax-farmers would no longer be a capital crime. And Jesuits would no longer be assigned to Cossack territory in the Southern Ukraine, so they would no longer pressure Orthodox to submit to Rome's authority. Finally, the Jews were to be evicted from the southern Ukraine.

When the bill came to a vote in 1648, the Sejm, dominated by the alliance of huge landowners and their Jewish administrators, defeated it, showing how the concentration of wealth and power into a few hands can enable a group to pursue its own interests in disregard of the common good, thus causing self-interest to push the nation over the brink into national disaster.

The situation in Poland was roughly analogous to that in Spain a century and a half earlier. Spain was the only other country in Europe with a similarly influential Jewish population. As in Poland, many Sephardic Jews caused resentment among the lower classes. During the famine in Cuenca in 1326 Jewish usurers charged farmers 40 percent interest on the money they needed to borrow to buy grain for sowing. Blasphemy was a Jewish custom in Spain. "Moses," according to Walsh, "had condemned blasphemers to death. Yet it was a custom of many Jews to blaspheme the Prophet for whom Moses had warned them to prepare."[119] The Jews in Spain "were disliked not for practicing the things that Moses taught, but for doing the things he had forbidden. They had profited hugely on the sale of fellow-beings as slaves, and practiced usury as a matter of course, and flagrantly."[120] Blasphemy went hand in hand with Jewish proselytizing, often by compulsion. Jews would force Christian servants to get circumcised as a condition of employment. They would encourage people to whom they had lent money to abjure Christ by promising to cancel their debts.

For many Jews in Amsterdam, who were former victims of the Spanish Inquisition, 1648 might have been the dawn of redemption. Instead of salvation, the Polish Jews got Bogdan Chmielnicki, who brought them liberation from the ghetto in a way they neither foresaw nor desired. The defeat in the Sejm turned the hopeful expectation of the Cossacks into equally vehement outrage, which was mobilized by Chmielnicki, a Cossack who was 53 years old when the Sejm voted against enfranchising the Cossacks, and had

a personal stake in the matter. A Jew by the name of Zachariah Sabilenki, according to Graetz,

> had played him a trick, by which he was robbed of his wife and property. Another had betrayed him when he had come to an understanding with the Tartars. Besides injuries which his race had sustained from Jewish tax farmers in the Ukraine, he, therefore, had personal wrongs to avenge.[121]

Chmielnicki's claim, "The Poles have delivered us as slaves to the cursed breed of Jews,"[122] resonated among the Cossacks, bringing them into open revolt. When Chmielnicki and his Cossack and Tartar hordes defeated the Polish army in May 1648, widespread looting, pillaging, and murder ensued; 100,000 Jews perished in the mayhem. Some pretended to be Christian to escape the wrath. Some accepted baptism as the price of saving their lives. Chmielnicki's pogroms became what the riots in Spain would have become without benefit of the Inquisition. Resentment had built up for too long for this blaze to burn itself out quickly.

The Cossacks held the Poles responsible for the behavior of the Jews, even though the average Pole also suffered from the system of financial exploitation that enraged the Cossacks. Prince Vishnioviecki, whom Graetz calls "the only heroic figure amongst the Poles at that time,"[123] did what he could to protect the Jews, but that wasn't much given the magnitude of the forces that opposed him. In many towns, the Jews put aside their separatist instincts and allied themselves with local Catholics in mutual defense against the bloodthirsty Cossacks. Sometimes the pact succeeded; sometimes it didn't. When Chmielnicki's Cossack hordes arrived at the gates of Lwow, he demanded that all Jews within the city's walls be handed over to him as a condition of lifting the siege. The Poles refused, and many Jewish lives were saved. According to the Jewish historian Henryk Grynberg: "The Polish armies, who were at war with [the Cossacks], were the sole defenders of the Jews."[124] Chmielnicki's animus was directed equally against the Catholic Church and the Jews. When he was sober enough to dictate the conditions of peace after an attack, he invariably demanded expulsion of both from areas the Cossacks controlled.

Poland's neighbors exploited the situation, setting in motion events that would lead to Poland's partition at the end of the 18th century. Muscovy, Prussia, Sweden, Brandenburg, and the Ottoman Empire all nibbled at territory Poland was too weak to defend. Poland lost, as a result, 200,000 inhabitants, half of whom were Jews. The Uniates of the Ukraine were forcibly converted to Orthodoxy, diminishing the Catholic and Polish influence on the southern flank of Lithuania, which had converted to Catholicism largely through Polish influence.

The Chmielnicki pogroms, occurring in the purported messianic year of redemption, strengthened those Jews who felt that messianic deliverance, ushered in perhaps by catastrophe, was closer than ever. The idea that the

messiah would hear and answer the prayers of his people in time of need became transmuted into a belief that dire need was a sign that the messiah's arrival was imminent. The alembic that enabled this religious alchemy was Cabala, which had instilled the messianic expectation in the first place.

Gershom Scholem disagrees with those who see the Chmielnicki uprisings as the cause of the messianic fever that swept European Jewry during the middle of the 17th century. "If the massacres of 1648 were in any sense its principal cause," Scholem argues, "why did the messiah not arise within Polish Jewry?"[125] The source of messianic fervor, according to Scholem, was "none other than Lurianic kabbalism, that is that form of Kabbalah which had developed at Safed, in Galilee, during the sixteenth-century and which dominated Jewish religiosity in the seventeenth-century."[126] According to the Cabala, catastrophe and utopianism go hand in hand. A catastrophe like the Chmielnicki massacres meant that redemption was at hand.

The most immediate consequence of the Chmielnicki uprising was a massive exodus from the Jewish paradise in the east. Penniless Jewish refugees streamed west. At this moment the legend of the wandering Jew was born. A race whose scriptures begin with a description of paradise and whose formative moment was escape from bondage in Egypt could not get the idea of escape into another paradise out of its head. So, having heard stories of the prospering displaced Sephardim, their impoverished Ashkenazic cousins streamed toward Hamburg and Amsterdam, the Dutch Jerusalem. Amsterdam thus became a staging area for the ongoing experimentation in revolution which is the modern world. With the two main branches of Judaism converging in a land recently ripped by force from the Spanish empire, a new *modus vivendi* was inevitable. It was the revolutionary idea, promoted by Jews, often not surprisingly full of outrage at the Inquisition, and by disaffected German-speaking clerics full of revulsion at the order the Church had imposed on Europe.

On January 30, 1649, eight months after Chmielnicki had defeated the Polish army, while the slaughter of Jews was in full swing, the Puritan Demi-Jews executed the English king. His death warrant was signed by 59 "saints"; Cromwell's name was third on the list. One commentator called the execution of the king "an earth-shattering event."[127] He would have done better to call the regicide world-shattering, because it shattered a number of worlds, all medieval. The Jew and the Demi-Jew presided at the birth of a new age, an age they saw as the dawn of redemption. That new age and the Jewish/Puritan alliance at its heart is still with us, driving American foreign policy, to give a recent example, to war with Iraq. Like the wars it spawned, that new age would be as bloody as the events which inaugurated it.

THE NEW AGE IS BORN THROUGH A PURITAN-JEWISH ALLIANCE

The revolutionary link between Jews and Reformers was theoretical as well as practical. The "Reformers" could justify their criminal behavior only by cloaking it in the imagery of the Old Testament. Regicide was the most heinous of crimes and viewed with revulsion by all of Christian Europe, and yet Cromwell justified his role in the murder of Charles I by appealing to the story of Phineas. "Be not offended at the manner," Cromwell wrote to Lord Wharton in January 1650,

> perhaps no other way was left. What if God accepted the zeal, as He did that of Phineas, whose reason might have called for a jury? What if the Lord have witnessed this approbation and acceptance to this also, not only by signal outward acts, but to the heart also? What if I fear my friend should withdraw his shoulder from the Lord's work. . . through scandals, though false, mistaken reasonings.[128]

The subjunctive mood of Cromwell's self-justification indicates that not even the models he dragooned from the Old Testament could erase the guilt of regicide, but if they could not absolve him of his sin, they certainly acted as a palliative. Cromwell, according to one commentator,

> was making a startling reference to the biblical story of Phineas, who thrust a javelin through a sinfully copulating couple, thus saving the people of Israel from the wrath of God. In the end, only brutal summary justice against the King had served to complete God's work to save the nation from His wrath and to secure his continuing love.[129]

By 1649, when Charles I went on trial, the tradition of judaizing which had been extirpated from Spain had struck deep roots in England. Cromwell had become as versed in using Biblical figures as a rationalization for crimes as Walsingham had been in using Jewish spies from Spain and Portugal as agents in his war with the Catholic powers of Europe. The Puritans could implement the revolution precisely because they were judaizers, because revolution was at its root a Jewish idea. Based on Moses' deliverance of Israel, the revolutionary saw a small group of chosen "saints" leading a fallen world to liberation from political oppression. Revolution was a secularization of ideas taken from the Bible, and as history progressed the secularization of the concept progressed as well. But total secularization of the idea would have made the idea totally useless to the Puritan revolutionaries. Secularization in the 17th century was synonymous with judaizing. It meant effectively substituting the Old Testament for the New. The concept of revolution gained legitimacy precisely because of its Jewish roots. Graetz sees the attraction Jewish ideas held for English Puritans quite clearly. The Roundheads were not inspired by the example of the suffering Christ, nor were they inspired by the medieval

saints who imitated Him. They needed the example of the warriors of Israel to inspire them in their bellicose campaigns against the Irish and the Scots, who could be subjugated or exterminated because the Puritans saw them as latter day Canaanites. Similarly, if the King were an unworthy leader, he deserved to die at the hands of the righteous, who now acted, as the Puritans thought the Jews had, on direct orders from God. Judaizing solved the problem of moral and political legitimacy. It allowed the judaizer a free hand to ransack the Old Testament for models that would justify sexual appetite, as in the case of Milton and the Ranters, or regicide and *libido dominandi* in the case of Cromwell. Trying to fathom the attraction the Old Testament held for the Puritans, Graetz concludes

> The Christian Bible with its monkish figures, its exorcists, its praying brethren, and pietistic saints, supplied no models for warriors contending with a faithless king, a false aristocracy and unholy priests. Only the great heroes of the Old Testament, with fear of God in their hearts and the sword in their hands, at once religious and national champions, could serve as models for the Puritans: the Judges, freeing the oppressed people from the yoke of foreign domination; Saul, David, and Joab routing the foes of their country; and Jehu, making an end of an idolatrous and blasphemous house—these were favorite characters with Puritan warriors.[130]

Graetz admits the Puritans were involved in rationalization and projection when he concludes that:

> In every verse of the books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings, they saw their own condition reflected; every psalm seemed composed for them, to teach them that, though surrounded on every side by ungodly foes, they need not fear while they trusted in God. Oliver Cromwell compared himself to the judge Gideon, who first obeyed the voice of God hesitatingly, but afterwards courageously scattered the attacking heathens; or to Judas Maccabaeus, who out of a handful of martyrs formed a host of victorious warriors.[131]

Graetz put his finger on the heart of the issue when he identified Puritan role models as "at once religious and national champions." Judaizing, as Bernard of Clairvaux said, was a reversion by Christians grown weary of the freedom of the Gospels and longing for the bondage of the law, not unlike the Israelites when they longed for the fleshpots of Egypt after Moses led them from bondage. Messianic politics was one way to return to what was starkly called 'the vomit of Judaism.' Revolution as practiced by the Puritan judaizers was a reversion to a more primitive, pre-Christian political model. There was no separation of the two swords of pope and emperor here—or, to use the terms of a later more secular era, no separation of Church and State. Instead, pope and emperor were fused into one charismatic revenant of King David. Israel

had become ethnic again, except now the "real Jews" were Englishmen, the visible elect on earth, and England (or New England) was the New Jerusalem.

The Puritans wanted to become Jews for the same reason they wanted their visible elect on earth to replace the state Church, which they viewed as the Catholic Church with the king as pope. If they could absorb the Jews by converting them to their form of judaizing Christianity, they would be Jews themselves, the new chosen people, and England would be the New Jerusalem. "A desire was excited in the hearts of the Puritans to see this living wonder, the Jewish people, with their own eyes, to bring Jews to England, and, by making them part of the theocratic community about to be established, stamp it with the seal of completion."[132] This was less a desire for conversion than an attempt at ethnic and spiritual cannibalism. "If we absorb the Jews," this reasoning went, "we will become Jews."

If proof were needed of the maxim that history repeats itself, first as tragedy and then as farce, it could be taken from English history of the Puritan era. The tragedy of the regicide was followed by the farcical behavior of judaizing sects like the Ranters and the Diggers. Following the regicide, everything and anything seemed possible, as long as it was connected with the Jews. Parliament began a debate which sputtered along over the next few years on the topic of whether the Sabbath should be celebrated on Saturday, whether Parliament should adopt Hebrew as its official language, and whether the Torah should be the official law of the land.

Menasseh ben Israel followed these debates with increasing excitement. When Nathaniel Holmes, a Puritan divine, announced he wished "to become the servant of Israel and serve him on bended knee,"[133] what else could it mean but the time of the restoration of the Jews had come, and the coming of the messiah and the redemption of Israel was not far behind. Like the later collaboration between Zionists and televangelists, Jew and Puritan each tried to manage the mania that raged in England for his own advantage in the ensuing social chaos.

The murder of the king led to the collapse of morals, especially in the realm of sexual behavior. Cohn says the "excitement" was "most intense during the period of political instability and uncertainty which followed the execution of the King and lasted until the establishment of the Protectorate."[134] As Plato had predicted in the *Republic*, anarchy led to tyranny. Large numbers of "saints" went mad as they gave free rein to their sexual passions, until Cromwell had to impose martial law on the ungovernable population. In the meantime, sexual liberation was the infallible sign that the revolution had arrived. The logic of revolution was clear enough, and it would assume the same trajectory it had in Bohemia and Muenster. If the "saints" could commit an act as impious as murdering the king, then promoting the communality of wives seemed like small potatoes in comparison. In 1649-50 Gerard Winstanley was moved by supernatural illuminations to found the celebrated community of

"Diggers" near Cobham in Surrey. The Ranters and Diggers were to England what the Taborites and Adamites had been to Bohemia and the Anabaptists in Muenster.

In 1649 George Fox, founder of the Quakers, was thrown into prison in Coventry, where he learned how judaizing religion served as a cover for political and sexual revolution. "They said they were God,"[135] Fox said, describing the prisoners he met. After he reproved them "for their blasphemous expression," Fox realized that further preaching was a waste of breath, because "I perceived they were Ranters."[136] Other writers noticed the same sort of incorrigible behavior. Richard Baxter claimed that Ranters promoted

> a Cursed Doctrine of Libertinism, which brought them to all abominable filthiness of Life: They taught. . . that to the Pure all things are Pure (even things forbidden). And so, as allowed by God, they spoke most hideous words of Blasphemy, and many of them committed Whoredoms commonly: Insomuch that a Matron of great Note for Godliness and Sobriety, being perverted by them, turned so shameless a Whore, that she was Carted in the streets of London. . . . They say that for one man to be tyed to one woman, or one woman to one man, is a fruit of the curse; but they say, we are freed from the curse; therefore it is our liberty to make use of whom we please. . . this opinion they infer for these words of the Lord to Eve, Thy desire shall be to thy husband.[137]

The author of the pamphlet *The Routing of the Ranters* described a woman corrupted by their antinomian creed: "she tosseth off her glasses freely, and concludeth there is no heaven but the pleasures she enjoyeth on earth, she is very familiar at the first sight, and danceth the Canaries at the sound of a hornpipe."[138] The Ranters sang blasphemous parodies of the psalms and engaged in blasphemous parodies of the Eucharist, *e.g.*, a man took a piece of beef in his hand and tore it apart while pronouncing the words, "This is the flesh of Christ. Take and eat." Emboldened by the apparent suspension of the moral order in the new apocalyptic age, a ropemaker from Andover, William Franklin, left his wife and had sex with a number of women. One, Mary Gadbury, was convinced the Lord had destroyed Franklin's former body, so sleeping with him did not constitute the sin of adultery. Franklin also persuaded Gadbury he was the promised, and she, as a result of her intercourse with him, began to have visions. Like the Adamites in Bohemia, the Ranters were convinced they should throw off their clothes, because "Adam and Eve in innocency were naked, and were not ashamed."[139] Like the Anabaptists in Muenster, the Ranters held "our women are all in common."[140] In their attempt to justify the claim that "to the pure all things are pure," the Ranters, like Cromwell and Milton, invariably appealed to examples from the Old Testament. Those who were foolish enough to disagree with them were "yet on the borders of Aegypt" and not "with Moses on Mount Hermon."[141]

Abiezer Coppe, once a "poor scholar" at Oxford who used to "entertain a wanton Housewife in his chamber," converted to Ranterism following the regicide of 1649.[142] Convinced that the best way to annihilate a troubled conscience was to sin boldly, Coppe preached "blasphemies and unheard-of villainies" while stark naked in broad daylight.[143] By night, he would "drink and lye with a Wench that had been also his hearer, stark naked."[144] Coppe was arrested in January 1650 but released one year later after he recanted his errors. All of England would go through much the same process ten years later after Cromwell's death.

Cromwell was convinced the anointing of the Lord was on him. Much of the modest deprecation in his accounts of what were undoubtedly brilliant military campaigns results from his judaizing conscience. If God had placed victory in his hands, then he was not morally responsible for his actions, whether the murder of the king or the slaughter of the Irish. Cromwell was merely extrapolating to the political and military realm the principles of exculpation Luther had announced in *De servo arbitrio*. His mental instability, particularly in its manic phase, may also have enhanced his feeling of being overpowered by the divine will.

On August 15, 1649, Cromwell landed with his army at Ringsend, near Dublin "for the propagating of the Gospel of Christ [and] the establishing of truth and peace."[145] Cromwell understood Catholic Ireland had posed a military threat to England ever since the defeat of the Spanish Armada. Had Philip II listened to Parma, he would have first crushed the rebellion in Holland and then used Ireland and Holland as twin bases of operation against England. Ireland had figured in the plans of Charles I, as Cromwell had learned after the Battle of Naseby in 1645. But he needed no special intelligence to fathom the intentions of the Irish. They had showed their hand in 1641, one year before the civil war in England, when they rose against their Protestant masters, confirming their view that the Irish were "vicious, bloody, and ruthless, and could not be trusted."[146] Ireland would provide Cromwell's first test case. Popery could be extirpated and then civilized Protestants and Jewish tax-farmers could run the country according to godly principles. "The rising of 1641," says Litton, "provided an ideal opportunity for the English government to assert its authority in Ireland and plans were laid for large-scale confiscations of land."[147]

After announcing to his army of 12,000 men that their task was to bring "the Gospel of Christ" to the "barbarous and bloodthirsty Irish and the rest of their adherents and confederates,"[148] Cromwell marched to the walls of Drogheda on the River Boyne and demanded the immediate surrender of the garrison there. Ironically, the walls of Drogheda were manned largely by English soldiers who were Catholics (some defenders were English Protestants) who threw their lot in with the Irish, just as English Catholics of an earlier generation had thrown their lot in with the King of Spain in the Netherlands.

After putting his siege guns in place on September 10, Cromwell demanded unconditional surrender. When the garrison refused, Cromwell fell into a manic rage. No quarter was given when the New Model Army breached the walls and swarmed into the town. "[T]he order to give no quarter, largely obeyed, came directly from Cromwell," who later wrote that "our men getting up to them, were ordered by me to put them all to the sword. And indeed, being in the heat of action, I forbad them to spare any that were in arms in the town, and I think, that night they put to the sword about 2,000 men."[149] The killing of defenseless civilians continued for days. Cromwell's men

> seem to have been overwhelmed with their commander's passion, and pursued the defenders, mostly English Royalist troops, through the narrow streets, killing all before them. Some attempt may have been made to avoid civilian deaths, but priests were another matter, and every priest seen was killed. In the church of St. Peter's to the north of Drogheda, dozens of people crowded into the steeple for shelter; a fire was set below them and they burned to death as if they were in a chimney.[150]

While his mood swings may have influenced the initial decision, the decision to continue the slaughter seems calculated. Cromwell wanted to spare himself the bother of further sieges; he thought spreading terror was the best means to that end. "The Enemy," he wrote later, "were filled with much terror. And truly I believe this bitterness will save much effusion of blood, through the goodness of God."[151] Cromwell rationalized his decision by claiming "he was doing God's work and that credit for the victory belonged to the Lord," but he also implied the slaughter was a just punishment for the rebellion of 1641, although "Drogheda had never been a strong Confederate Catholic town and it is unlikely that many of the civilians had been involved in the atrocities of 1641."[152] As in other battles, Cromwell ascribed the victory to God, who helped his army "hold forth and maintain. . . the glory of English liberty in a nation where we have an undoubted right to it."[153] The Irish were cowed by the terror, or, as Andrew Marvell put it, "And now the Irish are ashamed/To see themselves in one year tamed."[154] In May 1650, Cromwell sailed to England, where he was greeted like a conquering Caesar. After savoring the adulation, Cromwell left for Scotland, where he crushed the numerically superior Scottish forces with brilliant cavalry maneuvers at the Battle of Dunbar. As before, Cromwell wrote a letter to Parliament modestly ascribing the victory to God, and thereby absolving his conscience. "We that serve you," he wrote, "beg of you not to own us, but God alone; we pray you own His people more and more, for they are the chariots and horsemen of Israel. Disown yourselves, but own your authority, and improve it to curb the proud and the insolent, such as would disturb the tranquillity of England."[155] Cromwell was elated. To one colleague he seemed full of a "divine impulse" and "did laugh so excessively as if he had been drunk and his eyes sparkled with spirits," feeling

that the Scots had been rejected by the Lord and "my weak faith had been upheld."[156] Like the Muslims, Cromwell and the Puritans tended to take the fact as a sign of divine approval. Cromwell found this psychological weapon remarkably easy to wield against foes, all of whom, whether Scots, Irish, or Cavalier, were portrayed as godless. It would prove more difficult to wield the same theological and psychological weapons against the left-wing of his own party, as Cromwell discovered in dealings with Fifth Monarchy Men.

REDEMPTION MEANS REVOLUTION

In 1625 a war broke out between Turkey and Venice over who was to control trade in the Levant. Unable to do business in Constantinople, English and Dutch merchants transferred their offices to Smyrna where they valued the honesty and probity of a certain Mordecai Zevi. English and Dutch merchants routinely hired Jews as go-betweens in dealings with the Turks because they knew the local languages and because of their influence with the Sublime Porte. Because Mordecai Zevi "executed his commissions with strict honesty," he "enjoyed the confidence of the principals and became a wealthy man."[157] One year after the outbreak of war, Mordecai's wife gave birth to a son on the 9th of Ab (August 1626), the date on which the Temple in Jerusalem had been destroyed. The Ninth of Ab must have fallen on Saturday that year, because Mordecai named his son Shabbetai. Shabbetai grew up the child of privilege. Like most Jews of his age, Shabbetai studied the Talmud, but he excelled in other fields, notably music. As a young man, Shabbetai Zevi was exceptionally good looking with a full beard and permanently rosy cheeks. In addition, he had an exceptionally pleasing hypnotic voice. Like the young Asiatic god Dionysos of an earlier age—a god, it should be noted, who also came from Anatolia—or like the Dionysian rock stars of a later age, Shabbetai Zevi could sway crowds with his singing, changing their mood as if by magic.

In addition to musical talent, Shabbetai Zevi seems to have had a mystical bent, a trait probably magnified by his mental instability. Like Cromwell, Shabbetai Zevi was a manic-depressive. He differed from Cromwell only in the magnitude of his mood swings; where Cromwell felt he had been anointed by God, Shabbetai Zevi felt he was the messiah. Shabbetai Zevi had heard the English merchants in his father's house describe the increasing political instability in England, leading to the civil war, which broke out when Zevi was 16. Defeated by the Puritans, the English King was put on trial when Zevi was 21 and executed when he was 22. According to Graetz, Mordecai Zevi was not only familiar with the particulars of the millennial fervor which grew throughout the 1640s, he communicated his enthusiastic belief in "the apocalypse of the Fifth Monarchy" to the members of his family, "none of whom listened more attentively than Sabbatai," who was "already entangled in the maze of the Luryan Cabala and inclined to mistake enthusiastic hopes

for prosaic facts."[158] The tales of apocalypse which Shabbetai Zevi had heard in his youth became powerful enough to convince him that he himself was the messiah which everyone had been expecting. The revolution in England, followed by the murder of that country's Christian king, coupled with the massacres in Poland and the mass migration of Jews which it encouraged had convinced many older and more sober Jews that the end of the world was at hand. Someone as mentally unstable as Shabbetai Zevi, on the other hand, seems to have become unhinged by the course of events.

The Zohar didn't help matters any. A young man of privilege who was mystically inclined and mentally unstable would quite naturally find corroboration in the mumbo-jumbo of the Cabala. The expulsion of the Jews from Spain coupled with the massacre of the Jews in Poland led the Jews inexorably to the Zohar for an explanation of their plight, and the Zohar, given new plausibility by the writing of the Spanish refugee Isaac Luria, reinforced the apocalyptic sense that had driven people to the Cabala for explanation.

Lurianic Cabala not only prepared the way for the Chmielnicki pogroms, it was also the result of the other great catastrophe of Jewish life at that time, the expulsion of the Jews from Spain. Isaac Luria ben Solomon (1534-72) gathered a group of disciples bent on spreading his explanation of Jewish exile, of how recent catastrophes fit into the plan of divine redemption. To do this Luria had recourse to the Gnostic mythology circulating in the Mediterranean world since the first heresies of the Christian era. God had created bowls to contain the light of his understanding. The bowls proved incapable of containing that light and broke, scattering the light throughout creation, where it remained imprisoned in matter. The realm of *qelippah*, where the sparks are held in bondage, is a distinctly political realm "represented on the terrestrial and historical plane by tyranny and oppression."[159] The purpose of man's existence on earth became *tiqqun* or healing, restoring the lights to their original place in the universe before the breaking of the vessels had released the forces of sin and evil. The Diaspora was now readily explainable. Jews were dispersed to be better able to discover the holy sparks, extract them from the matter they were enmired in, and then return them to their rightful place in the universe. When this was accomplished, the messiah would come, and redemption would be complete. Redemption, according to Lurianic doctrine, was bound up with man's efforts and the process of history, a combination which was incorporated, via Hegel, into Karl Marx's revolutionary theory three hundred years later. The Jew's role is to bring about redemption, which does not descend suddenly, "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye" from on high but rather

> appears as the logical and necessary fruition of Jewish history. Israel's labors of ***tiqqun*** are, by definition, of a messianic character. Final redemption is therefore no longer dissociated from the historical process

> that preceded it: "The redemption of Israel takes place by degrees, one purifying after another, one refining after another." The messianic king, far from bringing about the *tiqqun*, is himself brought about by it: he appears after the *tiqqun* has been achieved. The cosmic redemption of the raising of the sparks merges with the national redemption of Israel, and the symbol of the "ingathering of the exiles" comprises both.[160]

The political implications of the Lurianic Cabalah seem clear enough. The messiah must wait upon man's efforts. He can only come once the process of *tiqqun* or purification and healing has been accomplished by man, i.e., by the Jews on earth, who act as the vanguard of redemption much as the Communist party later would function as the vanguard of the proletariat. Without *tiqqun*, "it is impossible that the messianic king come."[161] From here it is but a short leap to the conclusion that Israel had become its own messiah, or as Scholem says, "By transferring to Israel, the historical nation, much of the redemptive task formerly considered as the messiah's, many of his distinctive personal traits, as drawn in apocalyptic literature, were now obliterated."[162]

David Horowitz sees the same political meaning in the Lurianic revision of the meaning of exile. Once the meaning of exile had been transformed by its incorporation into the Gnostic creed of Luria's Cabala, "redemption is no longer a divine release from the punishment of exile, but a humanly inspired transformation of creation itself."[163] What is true of Israel's exile is *a fortiori* true of mankind's exile in the *qelippoth* or husks of matter. Luria's essentially Gnostic thought projects evil away from the heart of man into structures outside of himself, which is to say, political structures, which can be changed by human effort. Instead of evil emanating from the heart, evil emanates from evil things in an evil universe, which is begging to be changed by those who know its secrets, i.e., the cabalists. "Practical" Cabala, says Scholem, "is synonymous with magic."[164] Some of Luria's followers felt they could "force the end" by an act of "practical Kabbalah," which is to say by "invoking holy names and Kabbalistic formulae."[165] Since the sparks have been "tricked" into matter, it might be possible to trick them out again by the use of what Hayim Vital termed "holy fraud."[166]

Like the concept of insincere conversion, the concept of "holy fraud" would find its most immediate embodiment in the Jewish messiah Shabbetai Zevi, but it would perdure long after Zevi's demise. The cabalists will lead the world to redemption through magic (or applied science and technology) and trickery, not by leading good lives while waiting patiently for the redeemer to come, because "in the Gnostic view, the evil that men do emanates not from their own flawed natures, but is the result of a flaw in the cosmos they inhabit, which they can repair."[167] As a result of Luria's Gnostic transformation of Jewish thought, "Man" becomes "his own redeemer."[168] Exile was, according to Luria,

> no longer a punishment, but a mission; no longer a reflection of who we are, but a mark of our destiny to become agents of salvation. In this Gnostic vision, Israel is dispersed among the nations in order that the light of the whole world may be liberated. In the words of the cabalist Hayim Vital: "This is the secret why Israel is fated to be enslaved by all the Gentiles of the world: In order that it may uplift those sparks of the Divine Light which have also fallen among them. . . . And therefore it was necessary that Israel should be scattered to the four winds in order to lift everything up." *The Israelites are the first revolutionary internationalists.*[169]

Lurianic Cabala was also a reaction to the Inquisition. By the time of the Chmielnicki massacres, it had spread to all parts of the Diaspora. "Wherever Lurianism came," Scholem writes, "it produced messianic tension."[170] It produced expectation of redemption. But now, Scholem points out, "redemption meant a revolution in history."[171] Since Lurianism created the messianic fervor of the mid-17th century, it is not an exaggeration to say it created the revolutionary mindset that characterizes the modern world. The modern world emerged when medieval Judaism, having fostered northern Europe's rebellion against Rome, cracked open and fell apart when Lurianism found its fulfillment in Shabbetai Zevi, the false messiah. Jewish Gnostic messianism, with the help of English Puritan revolutionaries, was released from the ghetto into the nascent modern world that succeeded the medieval world and was its antithesis. The messianic age of the mid-17th century "was an age characterized by rebellion against the Catholic Church and the order which the Church had imposed on Europe since the fall of the Roman Empire. A millennium of Catholic culture was threatened by the resurgence of an old idea."[172]

The resurgent old idea was the notion that the millennium meant restoration of the "terrene Kingdome of the Jewes," an idea condemned, but not destroyed, by the Council of Ephesus in 431. The new name for that old idea was revolution. When the ghetto was cracked open, but not destroyed, by the Inquisition, the Chmielnicki pogroms, and the disillusionment which followed the false messiah's conversion to Islam, the concept of revolution escaped through those cracks in the ghetto walls into European culture. As the messianic fervor grew toward the mid-17th century, the Cabala, as interpreted by Isaac Luria, became the only instrument which could make sense of the increasingly apocalyptic chain of events.

Inspired by reports from England and Poland, Shabbetai Zevi's behavior began to reflect the bizarre and apocalyptic nature of his age. Zevi married in 1648 but seems not to have consummated the marriage, something historians deduce from his wife's petition for a divorce, which Zevi did not contest, within the same year. There was a sexual component to his behavior as well. As a youth, Zevi "is said to have been tortured by nightmarish dreams, whose sexual character is beyond doubt."[173] During his waking hours, he was assailed

by "the sons of whoredom" who are "the scourges of the children of man."[174] According to Scholem, "the latter is the Zohar's technical term for those demons born of masturbation."[175]

By the age of 20, Zevi's voice and charismatic personality had gathered around him a small circle of followers in Smyrna. Zevi heard a voice inside him which said, "thou art the savior of Israel."[176] Lured further into what Graetz calls "the labyrinth of the Zohar"[177] as the only plausible explanation for the apocalyptic events of the age, Zevi uttered the Tetragrammaton in the presence of his followers. Mentioning the name of God was strictly prohibited among devout Jews. The fact that Zevi uttered it meant the old age was at an end. Zevi—here the Christian influences are unmistakable—had come to abolish the law, and the surest way to show the Old Law was no longer in force was to engage in actions the Old Law forbade. "It was only in Christianity," Scholem writes, "that the Messiah had revealed new commandments—or so at least it seemed to Jews who heard Christian arguments about the Law of Moses being superseded since the advent of the Messiah by the laws and customs of the church."[178]

Soon Shabbetai Zevi began to preach the concept of "doing a good deed by sinning," an idea similar to the antinomianism the Ranters were preaching in England. In one of his frequent bouts of hair-splitting, Scholem attacks Graetz for claiming that Zevi got 1666 as the date of the apocalypse from the English revolutionaries, and in doing so loses sight of the forest for the trees. Radical thought moved back and forth between Jews and judaizing revolutionaries. It is easier to believe that Zevi was influenced by radical thought, regardless of which date he chose as the mystical year of redemption, than to believe that, living in a house frequented by English merchants, he was unaffected by reports of what was going on in England. After uttering the Tetragrammaton, Shabbetai Zevi ate pork and engaged in prohibited sexual activity; he encouraged his followers to do likewise. Scholem says "there is no proof that anybody took him seriously at the time,"[179] but the historical record contradicts Scholem. Zevi and his followers were expelled from Smyrna in 1651 because of the disruption they were causing. After traveling first to Salonika in Greece, then the largest Jewish community in the Ottoman Empire, Zevi and his followers wandered around the eastern Mediterranean, like an itinerant rock band hoping to bring about revolution by their songs.

THE GATHERING OF THE TEN LOST TRIBES

Menasseh ben Israel eventually wrote up Montezinos' story of the Jewish Indians of Ecuador in *Spes Israelis*, which translated into English as *The Hope of Israel*. *The Hope of Israel* became an instant best-seller in England when published in 1650, and it fueled the messianic fire raging in the camps of the Puritans and the Jews. The Jew and the Demi-Jew looked forward to

the imminent coming of the messiah, even if for the former it was the first coming and for the latter it was the second. Not deterred by details like this, both camps were swept up in the mania, and found themselves working for the goal of inaugurating the Apocalypse by allowing the Jews to return to England. Experts in Gematria added their fuel by developing calculations that confirmed the ravings of the Fifth Monarchy Men. The Zohar, true to the epithet Graetz attached to it, had predicted the arrival of the messiah soon after the year 1300, but that date was adjusted by 17th century cabalists to mean 1648. After 1648, the date was readjusted again. Some felt the prophecies would be fulfilled in 1655, but the overwhelming majority pinned their hopes on 1666.

Menasseh's hopes about Jewish migration to England were encouraged by the introduction of the Cartwright Petition in Parliament on Christmas Day 1648 (Puritans did not celebrate Christ's birth as a holiday). The Cartwright petition recommended the toleration "of all Religions whatsoever, not excepting Turkes, nor Papists, nor Iewes."[180] This attempt at leveling elicited a storm of protest. Clement Walker described it as "the last damnable design of Cromwell and Ireton" and a case of "Hebrew Jewes" working with the "uncircumcised Jewes of the Councell of Warre."[181] This collaboration of Jews and Puritans was "no marvell," one Royalist writer opined. Why should it be surprising "that those which intend to crucifie their King, should shake hands with them that crucified their Saviour."[182]

It became increasingly difficult to distinguish the Jews from their judaizing admirers and vice versa. Several months after the Petition was introduced, William Everard, a Digger, announced he was "of the race of the Jews."[183] He was not alone in his enthusiasm. Thomas Tany, a London goldsmith, was so taken up by the talk of liberty of conscience that he circumcised himself in preparation for the coming of the messiah. Tany felt that since the Christians came from the Jews, it was only logical to return in the dawning apocalyptic age. Then he and his followers, who had taken to living in tents in Lambeth and Greenwich, could proceed to Jerusalem, where they could join forces with the ten lost tribes, who were converging on Jerusalem from their secret hiding places in Egypt and Persia, to inaugurate the Apocalypse. Tany claimed he was "a Jew of the tribe of Ruben, begotten by the gospel, which is Massah, El, Jah, or Jehovah, Jesus or Christ, all these are but names of that one merciful thing that is God."[184] Although he circumcised himself, Tany remained a Christian who claimed to live according to the Mosaic covenant while still following Jesus Christ. Instead of using reason to resolve the contradictions in his theology, Tany resolved them by action. At around the same time that Menasseh set sail from Amsterdam to London, Thomas Tany set sail from London to the Holy Land in a "littel Bote"[185] he built. His carpentry was no better than his theology. While sailing to Amsterdam to rally the Jews to his cause, his "littel Bote" sank, and he drowned.

Angered by the market share the Dutch had garnered in the Orient while the English were slaughtering each other during their civil war, the English sent a delegation to Holland to propose a union of the two countries. Spurned by the Dutch, the English passed the Navigation Acts in October 1650, and then declared war, exhibiting the feeling, as one commentator put it, if you can't join them, beat them. Before returning to England to report on their failed mission, the delegation, headed by the Republican Judge Oliver St. John, met with Menasseh ben Israel in Amsterdam to discuss the possibility of Jewish migration to England. It was a severe case of mutual admiration. Menasseh was impressed with the zeal of the Puritan revolutionaries, especially by their execution of the Christian king as the fullest expression of their zeal. The English delegation was impressed by Menasseh's scholarship, as expressed in his best-seller, *Hope of Israel.*

Thomas Thorowgood had written *Jewes in America, or the Probability that the Indians are Jews* about the time Menasseh was writing *Hope of Israel.* When John Dury, "perhaps the most active millenarian theoretician in the Puritan revolution,"[186] was asked to write a preface for Thorowgood's book, he remembered stories he had heard from Jews in Holland while acting as Cromwell's agent there. Writing to Menasseh, Dury requested a copy of the Montezinos report. When he made it public, millennial fever in England received a new jolt. If great minds like this had come independently to the same conclusion, could anyone seriously doubt the Indians in America were Jews from the ten lost tribes of Israel? And if that were the case, could anyone doubt the end times were at hand? Once the Montezinos document circulated among the divines in England, they came to the unanimous conclusion that the climax of world history was at hand. The Ten Lost Tribes had been found; the Jews had come to the "ends of the earth." When they were admitted to England, their conversion would follow almost automatically, given the pure Gospel the Puritans preached and the holy lives they led. Once the Jews converted, Christ could return in his glory. Given events this momentous, it was clear, to Dury at least, that one of two things could happen. "It is the expectation of some of the wisest Jews now living," Dury wrote, "that about the year 1650, either we Christians shall be Mosaick, or else that they themselves Jewes shall be Christians."[187] An objective observer would most probably have come to the conclusion the English were on their way to becoming Jews, but Puritans like Dury did not see it that way. "Those sometimes poor, now precious Indians," Dury continued, "may be as the first fruits of the glorious harvest of Israel's redemption."[188] As further corroboration of his theory, Dury mentioned the reports of John Eliot, the "Apostle to the Indians" of Massachusetts. One could also add the testimony of William Penn, the Quaker, who "found it easy to discover signs of Judaism amongst the Indians."[189] After his first winter in Pennsylvania, Penn wrote living among the Indians was "like being in Duke Street in London, surrounded by Jews."[190]

Once the Jewish Indian theory received the imprimatur of intellectual respectability from the Puritan divines, they wanted to draw out its implications by inviting the Jews to migrate to England. If the Jews could be brought to "the ends of the earth," otherwise known as "*Kezeh ha-Arez*," or "*Angleterre*" or England, then the Puritan divines could usher in the Millennium. That was why St. John's delegation showed up at Menasseh's synagogue in Amsterdam.

Menasseh had his own reasons for pursuing the relationship with the English. During 1650, Menasseh had conversations with a Portuguese Jesuit, Antonio de Viera, who had tried to use the Jewish Indian theory to support a Joachim of Fiore inspired world-wide brotherhood of Jews and Christians under the rule of the King of Portugal. Menasseh, according to Fisch, "responded warmly to Viera's version of history in which a restored people of Israel would have a central role."[191] He also began wondering "how best these enthusiasms could be channeled into his own messianic agenda."[192] Viera's reading of the end times got Menasseh thinking how he could use millennial expectation among the Puritans to Jewish advantage. So Menasseh encouraged these ideas among the English Puritans as a way of "furthering the ends of Jewish Polity."[193] "Menasseh's Politieia is the same as that of Maimonides. Its worldly nature and its existence in time stand out against the general Christian concept of the 'Kingdom of the Spirit.'"[194] He was both Marxist revolutionary and Zionist rolled into one, which Fisch recognizes when he links Menasseh

> to the fathers of modern Zionism in the nineteenth-century. They exhibit the same messianic typology as Menasseh. Moses Hess (*Rome and Jerusalem,* 1862) situates himself, literally, at the gates of Rome. If Rome could gain her independence in these latter days, why not Israel he argues. The intuition was sound. Like Menasseh he responded to the revolutionary movements of his time. Marxist revolutionary theory was the 19th century equivalent of Christian millenarianism in the 17th century—Hess used it but with reservations. Herzl later read the signs of his time—now was a time to speak of Jewish nationhood, for the rights of small nations were now a marketable commodity. . . . This is the dialogue with history which is the mark of normal Jewish messianism.[195]

After St. John and his delegation assured Menasseh that his petition would be warmly welcomed, they returned to England, and Parliament took up the idea of readmitting the Jews by considering the letter Menasseh submitted in support of his cause. Menasseh quickly got to the heart of what united the Jews and the Puritan judaizers: hatred of the Catholic Church. "Today," Menasseh wrote, "the English nation is no longer our ancient enemy, but has changed the Papistical religion and become excellently affected to our nation."[196] This effusion was not reassuring to non-judaizing Englishmen, especially the merchants in London, who feared the Jews as cut-throat competitors. Menasseh

addressed these concerns too. If the Apocalypse took a while in arriving, other benefits would accrue to the English if they let the Jews into their country. Menasseh "knew that the prophecy of Daniel held a crucial place in English thought,"[197] but he also knew the financial benefits the Dutch were reaping by allowing Jewish commerce free rein there, weighed heavily on the mind of the saints in England. Menasseh developed his argument in a pamphlet entitled "How Profitable the Nation of the Jews Are," using the examples of Amsterdam and Hamburg, cities prospering because of the admission of the Jews, while Spain, which had expelled them, was in decline. Menasseh even addressed the delicate subject of commercial competition which might ensue if the Jews were admitted to England, pointing out that local craftsmen had nothing to fear because Jews did not work with their hands.

Had the political situation remained stable, Menasseh probably would have traveled to England in 1652, but the war between Holland and England delayed his departure by three years, during which Cromwell's power was seriously eroded by the deteriorating economic situation in England and by the defection of the Fifth Monarchy Men. By the time Menasseh finally got to England, the Fifth Monarchy Men identified Cromwell, not King Charles, as the Little Horn that the Book of Daniel warned against as the precursor to the Antichrist.

ENGLAND RETHINKS ADMITTING THE JEWS

On July 4, 1653 Cromwell opened the Barebones Parliament, which marked the high-water mark of judaizing in England. The Parliament derived its name from a London merchant of French extraction named Barbon. Full of enthusiasm for the new Puritan regime, Barbon changed his first name to Praise God, and his detractors changed his last name for him to the anglicized Barebones. Praise God Barebones wanted to change the law of the land to the Law of Moses. Cromwell was at the height of his power when he opened the Barebones Parliament. Named Lord Protector in April, and having an assembly of parliamentarians all of whom were saints, Cromwell felt he could deal with the issue of the admission of the Jews to England and all that it would bring with it. "Indeed," he told the assembled saints, "I do think something is at the door: we are at the threshold . . . you are at the edge of the promises and prophecies." It was time for God to "bring His people again from the depths of the sea,"[198] a veiled reference to the Jews. Others were less theological. The French ambassador to Holland felt Cromwell wanted to admit the Jews into England "to draw the commerce thither." Jewish trade had other benefits. As in the time of Walsingham, Jewish commerce and espionage went hand in hand, and "Cromwell used Jewish spies in gathering intelligence even before the Whitehall conference and seems to have continued with this practice more openly afterwards."[199]

Cromwell soon discovered that dealing with a parliament of saints was a mixed blessing. The judaizing left wing's attempt to turn parliament into the English version of the Sanhedrin was just one of the headaches that the Barebones Parliament was to cause Cromwell. By January 1654, he had enough, and in an effort to silence enemies of the Protectorate, Cromwell issued an ordinance making it high treason to "to write, print teach or preach that the Protector's authority was tyrannical, usurped, or unlawful."[200] This increased the outrage of the Fifth Monarchy Men. Hannah Trapnell, who had attacked Cromwell from the moment he became Protector, now identified him with the Little Horn of the Book of Daniel, and in June 1654, she was jailed at Bridewell for her impertinence. In September 1654, Thomas Goodwin, another saint, attacked Cromwell in "A Sermon on the Fifth Monarchy, Proving by Invincible Arguments that the Saints shall have Kingdom here on Earth, which is to come, after the Fourth Monarchy is destroy'd by the Sword of the Saints, the followers of the Lamb." He was of one mind with John Rogers, another Fifth Monarchy Man, who claimed, "Cromwell was the great dragon who sat in Whitehall, and must be pulled down."[201]

Losing patience with the very saints he had called into being as a body, Cromwell dissolved the Barebones Parliament in January 1655. In March the Royalist Colonel John Penrudduck attempted an armed insurrection in Wiltshire; in response, Cromwell imposed martial law on England, dividing England and Wales into military districts each ruled by a major-general who reported directly and exclusively to Cromwell and the Council. Cromwell's dealings with the saints left him disillusioned, but one illusion he refused to relinquish was the return of the Jews to England. He still "waited for the day to see union and right understanding between the godly people," by which he meant "Scots, English, Jews, Gentiles, Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptists and all."[202]

Menasseh continued to nourish the same hope. In September 1654, he sent David Dormido to London to plead his case for the admission of the Jews. Dormido hoped to curry favor for the Jews by pandering to prejudices against Spain and the Inquisition. His appeal to Cromwell was full of rhetoric "calculated to make Protestant blood run cold"[203] or to evoke Protestant pity by recounting the sufferings of the marranos at the hands of people who were England's enemies. A month before Dormido could hand in his proposal in writing, three admirals of the English fleet drew up a petition urging Cromwell to admit the Jews to England. Since Cromwell had made peace with the Dutch in April 1654, the final impediment had been removed for Menasseh's great mission to the English.

Menasseh set sail for London in September 1655, just as Thomas Tany set sail in the opposite direction on his ill-fated mission to gather the Jews of Amsterdam together and take them to Jerusalem. Tany's mission "perished in the sea,"[204] but Menasseh's seemed destined for success. Millennialist

expectations among the saints had primed England to receive his bizarre message with a credulity he would have never found before or afterward. Menasseh was no blind fanatic: if his story about the Jewish Indians met skepticism, he was ready to talk about the economic benefits of Jewish migration instead. But millennial expectation was his strong suit because "70 percent of the prolific ministers who published their works between 1640 and 1653 can be identified as Millenarians"[205] and the combined effect of these apocalyptic and millenarian speculations produced a sense of impending great events. Henry Wilkinson told the House of Commons in 1643 it was the "generall talk throughout the household among the domesticks. . . that Christ their king is coming to take possession of his Throne, they doe not onely whisper this, and tell it in the ear, but they speak it publikly."[206] In his *Declaration to the Commonwealth of England*, Menasseh milked that sentiment, claiming an "all but total dispersion" of the Jews throughout the world "except only in this considerable and mighty island."[207] Menasseh continued, "before the messiah come and restore our Nation, that first we must have our seat here likewise."[208] Menasseh got theological support from Nathaniel Holmes, who wrote, "We can expect no more then, in the said 1655 yeer but the call of the Jewes, who from that time shall strive with the Turke, and all enemies of the Jewes conversion five and forty yeers, Dan. 12 afore their settlement, before which Call I expect the fall of the Roman Antichrist."[209] Holmes felt the Jews would convert to Christianity once exposed to its pure form in England. Menasseh passed over that part of the English millennial mania in silence, just as he had passed in silence over the more objectionable passages of Paul Felgenhauer's "half-insane" treatise,"[210] *Good News of the Messiah for Israel*, which Felgenhauer, the Bohemian mystic, in a moment of ecumenical warmth, had dedicated to Menasseh. Details like just who the messiah was could be worked out after the Jews had established themselves in their new country.

In October 1655, Menasseh left his English lodgings in full rabbinic regalia with a number of pamphlets under his arm and marched to Whitehall, where the Council was in session. He was not allowed to address the Council, but he met with Cromwell, who seems to have fallen under his spell. For the next two months, Cromwell used all of the power at his disposal to get a hearing for the Jews and gain their admission to England. In November 1655 Cromwell produced a petition in favor of admitting the Jews to the Council. Cromwell had "resolved to force its acceptance with a minimum of delay,"[211] but the Council passed no resolution. On December 4, the Council concluded "there was no law which forbade the Jews' return to England."[212] On December 12, Major General Whalley testified on behalf of the Jews, claiming "there are both politique and divine reasons: which strongly make for therye admission into a cohabitation with us. Doubtless to say no more, they will bring in much wealth into this Commonwealth; and where wee both pray for theyre

conversion, and beleevie[ing] it shal be, I knowe not why we should denye the meanes."[211]

Cromwell's zeal on behalf of the Jews got them wondering whether he might not be the messiah himself. To find out, a delegation of Jews was dispatched to Cromwell's birthplace to examine the church records to see if there were genealogical evidence indicating that he was of the House of David. Cromwell packed the Council with his supporters to get a favorable vote, but again the Council declined to act. Instead they came up with a number of conditions that gave the Jews second thoughts. Menasseh found himself in the middle between two sides that both seemed to be getting cold feet. The marranos who were leading fairly comfortable lives in London already saw Menasseh's mission as jeopardizing what they already had by making the darker side of Jewish life emerge during the discussion. The English, for their part, were beginning to realize that the Jews of 17th century Europe were not identical to the Hebrews they had read about in the Old Testament.

Cromwell pulled out all stops, but when the Council met for the last time on December 18, 1655, the tide had turned. Everyone had been in a state of millennial expectation too long, and the psychological fatigue was creating a reaction. Beyond that, council members had read one of the most effective polemics in the history of English logomachy, a tract known as *A Short Demurrer*, written by William Prynne, an opponent of the Jews. In his *Demurrer*, Prynne put together a "faithful compilation of the materials available in his day for a history of the Jews in England."[214] That history included the stories of the ritual murders of William of Norwich in 1144 and Little St. Hugh of Lincoln in 1255 in addition to a catalogue of many lesser evils. In his *Demurrer*, Prynne claimed the Jews had been expelled from England in 1290 for good reason. They "had been formerly greater clippers and Forgers of Money, and had crucified three or four children in England at least."[215] As a result of the Jews' behavior then and the parlous state of religious life in England in the wake of the revolution and regicide, Prynne concluded "now [was] a very ill time to bring in the Jews."[216] Since the people of England "were so dangerously and generally bent to Apostasy and all sorts of Novelties and Errors in Religion," it was more likely they "would sooner turn Jews, that the Jews Christians."[217]

Prynne's *Demurrer* had an even greater effect on public opinion, which was weary of Puritan fanaticism and the civil discord it brought, than it did on the Council. Councilors on the way to their chamber met soldiers on the street who felt, "We must now all turn Jews, and there will be nothing left for the poor."[218] Even philosemites like Josselin were having second thoughts. He prayed the Lord would "hasten their [the Jews'] conversion" because he feared the opposite might happen "if the Jews gained admission to England." He was "heartily afraid" the admission of the Jews would cause Englishmen to turn "aside from Christ to Moses." One wag claimed "they," meaning the Jews,

"are all turned Devils already, and now we must all turn Jews."[219] Another opponent claimed

> though perhaps there may not be now in England, any great numbers of professed Iewes (some to my own knowledge there are, who have their own synagogues and there exercise Iudaisme). Yet, they who live here, as often as they are bound to use their office of Prayer (which is twice a day) so often are they bound to blaspheme Christ, and to curse him and all true Christians which beleeve in him.[220]

Cromwell did his best, but when the final meeting ended, hope for the Jews' readmission was gone. With unintended irony, Katz says "one of the oddest features of this debate was that the lack of Jews in England should have made possible a positive view of them."[221] The simple fact is that the tenor of debate changed when the Council abandoned its romantic notions of the Old Testament Hebrews and replaced that with the picture of actual Jews as they then lived in countries with large Jewish populations. Through Prynne's *Demurrer*, English common sense triumphed over Puritan ideology. While many Englishmen felt "the Jews might be tolerated if suitable precautions could be devised," an equally large segment, if not a majority, felt "if the Jews were admitted they would seduce and cheat the English."[222] James Harrington thought a compromise might be reached by sending the Jews to Ireland, where they could grind the Irish as tax-farmers, as in Poland. Under no circumstances, however, should the Jews be admitted to England, because to "receive the Jewes after any other manner into a Commonwealth, were to maim it," because Jews "never assimilate, and instead become parasites on the state."[223]

The most surprising conversion was that of John Dury. Dury was on the continent during the Whitehall conference, but he made his feelings known to the council by letter of January 8, 1656, in which he argued admission of the Jews was lawful and "expedient."[224] Dury had contemplated admission of the Jews since the early 1640s. In fact, he had helped fuel the Jewish Indian mania by acting as a go-between between Thorowgood and Menasseh. Yet by January 22, even he was having second thoughts as a result of reading Menasseh's petition. Dury thought Menasseh's request excessive. He also felt England should "go warily and by degrees" in granting Jews admission to England because Jews, Dury noted, "have ways beyond all other men to undermine a state and to insinuate into those that are in office and prejudicate the trade of others; and therefore, if they be not wisely restrained, they will in short time, be oppressive, if they be such as are here in Germany."[225] Dury was no anti-Semite. He was a philo-Semite who had promoted Jewish causes in the past and who would later raise money for Jews in Jerusalem who were reduced to poverty when the Swedish naval blockade of eastern Europe curtailed alms from reaching them.

Convinced Jews could not be trusted to keep oaths and mindful of the injuries Jews had inflicted on Englishmen "in life, chastity, goods, or good name"[226] before the expulsion of 1290, the Council listed seven restrictions as the condition of their readmission. The purpose of the seven restrictions, which included prohibitions against "defaming Christianity, working on Sunday and employing Christian servants" was to "protect Englishmen against the economic and religious rapacity of the Jews."[227]

On January 25, three days after the arrival of the Dury letter, the Tuscan envoy noticed the change in mood among Council members and the public at large. "In the matter of the Jews," he wrote, "people do not speak as much as they used to do at the outset. Everyone now believes that the Lord Protector will not make any declaration in their favor, but will tacitly connive at the private conventicles which they hold at present in their houses as long as they give no open scandal."[228] Sagredo, the Venetian ambassador, felt that Jewish conniving still had a fair chance of success, because "the Jews having powers to spend a great deal of money, are getting a hold and it is believed that they will make no mistake in winning over the divines and the ministers, and that they will be able to break down every obstacle by the power of gold."[229] A Royalist spy concurred. Even though "the generality oppose[d]" the admission of the Jews, the Jews "will be admitted by way of connivancy."[230]

By February 15, the Tuscan envoy concluded the prospect of admitting the Jews was dead. "Cromwell," says Roth, "had decided that public opinion was too strong for him. It would be impossible to readmit the Jews to the country excepting on humiliating conditions, so stringent as to be absolutely unacceptable to them and discouraging immigration rather than otherwise. Accordingly, he determined simply to maintain the state of affairs which he had found, informally allowing the Jews established in London to continue the observance of their ancestral rites without disturbance."[231] The issue was over. The council refused to budge. The Jews found the restrictions demeaning, insulting, and unacceptable; they took out their anger on Menasseh ben Israel, who was passed over in 1656 when the Jews of London chose Rabbi Moses Athias of Hamburg to lead their congregation.

The right of Jews to live in England was eventually established indirectly when a Jew named Robles was recognized as a Jew and not as a Portuguese Catholic, the fiction under which he had been living in London, when he brought a successful property action against the Spanish government. The admission of the Jews, according to Tuchman, took place in typically English fashion in a decision which was "illogical but workable" and "fortunate for the Jews when Commonwealth gave way to Restoration." Because there was "no statute on the books for Charles II to cancel," the king "reasonably allowed things to go as they were."[232] The Jews of the Restoration, thus, no longer had to engage in the charade of attending Mass at the chapel of the Spanish ambassador.

In 1656, the Quaker messiah James Nayler was greeted as the king of Israel when he entered Bristol. The messiah had finally arrived in England, or so the Quakers thought. Most Englishmen, however, greeted his arrival with derision. Millennial fatigue was setting in. By the end of 1656, the disillusionment was so palpable, poets expressed it in verse:

> Twere strange if this Prophetick
> year which brought
> Such Expectation, should have
> nothing wrought[233]

By the end of 1656, another *annus mirabilis* had come and gone with the messiah still a no show; Menasseh's great project had failed. Cromwell tried to assuage the pain by granting Menasseh a state pension of 100 pounds per annum, which he never paid. In September 1657, Menasseh wrote to Cromwell offering to "surrender my pension" if Cromwell will "supply me with 300 pounds"[234] up front. He never got that either, although his widow kept trying long after his death. After wandering about London "in a vain attempt to use his influence to procure some sort of official statement from Cromwell's government,"[235] Menasseh left England in poverty and disgrace to return to Amsterdam with no firm prospects. He needn't have worried about his worldly prospects. He died on the way home on November 20. Cromwell died one year later at the age of 59. The Fifth Monarchy Men, who considered Cromwell the Antichrist, made plans to stage the Apocalypse on the their own now that the Little Horn was in his grave. In August, 1659, the regicide Thomas Harrison issued a tract, *The Fifth Monarchy or Kingdom of Christ in Opposition to the Beasts*, demanding again that the Law of Moses be made the law of England, replacing the "heathenish tyrannous and popish laws"[236] still on the books. Harrison's suggestion was greeted with the same enthusiasm that met the Quaker messiah Nayler. England had had enough Apocalypse for a while. It was suffering from a bad case of Millennium fatigue.

On May 29, 1660, crowds greeted Charles II's arrival in London in a mood of general rejoicing. The English, it seemed, longed for a legitimate ruler as the best protection against would-be messiahs. Harrison was arrested one month earlier. He was found guilty of regicide and hanged at Charing Cross on October 13, 1660, barely six months after the return of the King. As he was dragged to his execution, Harrison cried out several times, "I go to suffer upon the account of a most glorious cause that ever was in the world,"[237] evoking derision from the mob.

Harrison's death did not quench the thirst for revenge against the Puritans. Three months after Harrison was hanged, the mob dug up Oliver Cromwell's body and dragged it through the streets of London to the gallows at Tyburn where it was hanged and desecrated. Sensing this wasn't enough, the mob cut the head off of Cromwell's corpse and stuck it on a pike outside Westminster

Hall, where it remained for 23 years. Cromwell's head, we are told, now rests in Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, but the exact place is secret.

By 1670, the Fifth Monarchy movement had disappeared completely. Millennial fever had burned itself out ten years earlier in England, but the drama wasn't over yet. In fact, events in England had set the stage for the climax of that drama in Turkey, where the Jewish messiah was waiting in the wings.

SHABBETAI ZEVI IS BELIEVED TO BE THE MESSIAH

During his stay among the Jews in the Morea, Zevi attracted a number of followers, largely because of his good looks and singing voice. His cheeks, we are told, "were red all the time."[238] He was tall and stout to the point of corpulence. Music filled him with enthusiasm, and he conveyed that enthusiasm to others. Because of contacts made on a previous trip to Cairo, Zevi was chosen to lead a delegation to Cairo in 1663 to raise money to ransom captive Jews. He remained there for two years. While there he renewed contact with Raphael Joseph Chelibi, a wealthy Jew who became his financial backer.

He also found a third wife. In March 1664, Zevi married a refugee from the Chmielnicki pogroms by the name of Sarah. Rabbi Jacob Sasportas, then head of the Jewish congregation in London, knew Sarah as a girl when she arrived in Amsterdam in 1655, at the climax of Menasseh's mission to England. He remembered her as "a girl devoid of intelligence," who claimed "she would marry the messianic king."[239] Rejected by the Jews in Amsterdam, Sarah moved to Leghorn, where she established a reputation as a beauty of legendary promiscuity. In Cairo, Zevi learned of her reputation and because of it he called her thither to become, in his phrase, "the wife of whoredoms."[240] All known sources document the licentious life Sarah had lived in Leghorn before the call to go to Cairo. Sasportas claims "he sent for her and married her" because of those rumors. Scholem likewise claims Zevi knew that his wife-to-be was a whore, and that he "married her precisely for that reason so as to imitate or fulfill the words of the prophet Hosea (1:2) 'take upon them a wife of whoredoms.'"[241]

Unsurprisingly, her promiscuity did not stop after the marriage. Indeed, Zevi seems to have put her to work using her sexual charms to seduce potential recruits and disarm potential opponents. Zevi once persuaded a doctor's son to enter his wife's room, hoping she would seduce him into becoming his follower. Like Joseph when approached by Potiphar's wife, the doctor's son fled, leading Zevi to complain, "If he had done her will, he would have performed a great *tiqqun*."[242]

Sarah inaugurated the regime of sexual license that characterized Zevi's followers. In approving her "acts of *tiqqun*," Zevi was referring to the Cabalist notion of "*tiqqun olam*," or healing the world, which he hoped to bring about

by a systematic violation of the Law. Unlike Christ who came to fulfill the law, not to abolish it, Zevi, the 17th century messiah of the Jews, came to abolish the law by urging the systematic violation of all its precepts. Zevi had already uttered the Tetragrammaton. Now he urged his followers to engage in anything the law considered "*treyf*," from eating pork to orgiastic sexuality. Zevi was far ahead of latter day sexual revolutionaries like Sigmund Freud and his disciple Wilhelm Reich. Freud, according to Bakan in *Sigmund Freud and the Jewish Mystical Tradition*, considered himself an avatar of Zevi.[243] Like Zevi, he dangled the prospect of release from all sexual prohibition and guilt in front of wealthy Americans to bring them and (most importantly) their money under his control. Carl Gustav Jung, Freud's *goyische* heir apparent, practiced the same *tiqqun* on wealthy Americans like Edith Rockefeller McCormick and her wealthy brother-in-law Medill. Wilhelm Reich, however, took the lessons learned from the masters and forged it into the science of sexual liberation as political control (cf. my *Libido Dominandi: Sexual Liberation and Political Control*).

In playing the pimp to his beautiful wife Sarah, Zevi engaged in a rudimentary form of the sexual liberation perfected by Jews like Wilhelm Reich in the 20th century. "Sarah's beauty and free manner of life," Graetz tells us, "attracted youths and men who had no sympathy with the mystical movement."[244] Writing a generation before Reich was born, Graetz had no way to articulate the full flowering of sexual liberation as a form of control that would take place during the the 20th century. But he had an inkling of how it worked, noting that Sarah's "loose conduct worked on the passions of the male population."[245] Because the Jews of Poland had lived sexually repressed lives, the energy released when "the bonds of chastity. . . were broken"[246] in Poland was much more explosive. Unchained *libido* made a significant contribution to the messianic fever sweeping from *shtetl* to synagogue across northern Europe.

With a retinue now increased by Sarah's seductive conquests and Chelibi's money, Zevi began to wend his way back to Smyrna. The steady regimen of wine, women, and song had intensified Zevi's bipolar moods. When he was up, Zevi soared in an exaltation that assured him that nothing less than the fulfillment of a divine mission could be the source of his emotion, but when he was down, he had nothing but doubts about himself. Zevi had one of those ecstatic experiences around the end of February or the beginning of March 1665. To resolve the doubts about his mission and visions, Zevi met with Nathan of Gaza, the noted Cabalist, in May 1665. Nathan was significantly younger than Zevi, but he had dedicated his life to study in the school of Lurianic Cabala that sprung up in Gaza after the master's death. Seeking *tiqqun* for his soul, Zevi approached Nathan with the trepidation of a man steeling himself to hear that he has been diagnosed with an incurable illness. To Zevi's surprise, Nathan prostrated himself before him and asked

forgiveness for not recognizing him as the messiah when he passed through Cairo on his way to Egypt. As in so many instances since then, the rise of the charismatic visionary or, in this case, the messiah could only take place when he had been endorsed by another source of authority and guidance. For this reason, Scholem dates the beginning of the Sabbatian movement as May 31, 1665. The movement would not have existed without Nathan's endorsement. Once he certified Zevi as the messiah, the other rabbis fell in line. Before long, it was dangerous to oppose Zevi.

When Zevi finally arrived in Smyrna in autumn 1665, his reputation, heightened by Nathan's endorsement, threw the Jews there into paroxysms of joy. "The madness of the Jews in Smyrna," we are told, "knew no bounds. . . . The delirium seized great and small. Women, girls and children fell into raptures and proclaimed Sabbatai Zevi in the language of the Zohar as the true redeemer."[247] Sensing the end of the world was at hand, Zevi's followers unroofed their houses and married off children of 12 and even 10 years of age, "so they might cause the souls not yet born to enter into life and thereby remove the last obstacle to the commencement of the time of grace."[248] The "confusion in men's brains" led them to incredible penances while at the same time "they abandoned themselves to the most extravagant delight."[249] Men and women danced with each other like maniacs in the streets, and as the mania spread, sexual excess proliferated, and the voice of reason was swept away in the tide of passion. Initially, the misgivings of skeptics were drowned out in the carnival of enthusiasm. When Rabbi Aaron de la Papa denounced the messianic mania, he was expelled from the synagogue and eventually driven out of Smyrna. When Chayim Penya, a wealthy Jew who had enjoyed the respect of his co-religionists, objected, he was physically assaulted in the synagogue and was "nearly torn to pieces by the raging multitude."[250]

Gradually, the messianic fervor spread beyond Smyrna, indeed, far beyond the boundaries of the Ottoman Empire to the Jewish Diaspora in Europe. In November, news of the tumult surrounding Zevi arrived at the Talmud Torah congregation in Amsterdam and "the great majority. . . were seized by messianic enthusiasm" there too.[251] Sabbatian elements were introduced into the synagogue service of the congregation that had sent Menasseh ben Israel off to England ten years earlier. That congregation wrote to Zevi, announcing he was the messiah promised by God. May God, they wrote, "bless, preserve, guard, help, assist, prosper, magnify, raise and highly exalt Our Lord the Great King, Sabbatai Sevi, the Anointed of the Lord, the Messiah son of David, the Messiah King, the Messiah Redeemer, the Messiah Saviour, our Messiah of Righteousness."[252]

In December 1665, Henry Oldenburg, John Dury's son-in-law, wrote to the young Dutch lens grinder Baruch Spinoza for his opinion on Zevi. Spinoza had been excommunicated from Menasseh's synagogue in 1656, while Menasseh was on his mission to England. Spinoza would become

posthumously famous as the man who applied Descartes to faith and morals and came up with what is arguably the first book of the Enlightenment. "All the world here," Oldenburg wrote to Spinoza from London, "is talking of a rumor of the return of the Israelites, dispersed for more than two thousand years to their own country. Few believe it, but many wish it. . . . Should the news be confirmed, it may bring about *a revolution in all things.*"[353] Spinoza's response, if there was one, has been lost. Since his excommunication, Spinoza had broken all contact with the Jews, so it is unlikely he could add anything to what Oldenburg already knew.

The Christians who burned to hear this news had pretty much disappeared from the stage of history when the news arrived. Major Harrison had been hanged five years before, and the Fifth Monarchy Men had dispersed. The Quakers had seen Nayler, their messiah, arrive in Bristol nine years earlier, and there is no indication they were interested in a repeat of that performance. With Shabbetai Zevi, it seems the spirit of apocalyptic mania had been exorcised from the judaizing Christians only to take up residence in more virulent form among the Jews themselves. The Jews perhaps felt the *goyim* had been deluded in thinking, not that the messiah would come, but that he would come from their own ranks. The messiah had to be a Jew, and when Cromwell proved unqualified, it was only a matter of time before a candidate would arise from the ranks of the Jews. The Jews of Hamburg flaunted their beliefs, claiming Christians would regret past persecution of the Jews under the new dispensation. Had the bemused Christians been able to enter the synagogues, they would have seen otherwise "serious respectable men . . . of Spanish stateliness" hopping, jumping, and dancing around like madmen with the Torah rolls in their arms. The Jews of Germany turned insolent, warning Christian neighbors that the tables would soon be turned and Christians would be persecuted when Zevi restored the Kingdom of Israel. In Heidelberg, a Lutheran minister reported, "The Jews are brimful of the hope of the messiah, running from one village to another and rushing in the streets from one house to another, in order to hear, with their ears pricked up, further news of the messiah."[354] To ridicule the folly of the Jews, German youths would blow trumpets in the middle of the night near the houses of the Jews so they could watch them come running out in their night clothes in expectation of the messiah. During the carnival in Prague in 1666, a play was performed ridiculing the expectations of the Jews, who had shut themselves up in their ghetto waiting to show who would have the last laugh. Jews in Hungary, many of whom were refugees from the Chmielnicki pogroms, sold their houses and made plans to travel to Jerusalem, to be present when Zevi ascended his throne. Reports even reached America, where the reaction against Puritanism had been delayed. Still favorably disposed to the reports of Thorowgood and Menasseh, Increase Mather preached that the saints of Boston "lived in a time when constant reports from sundry places and lands

gave out to the world, that the Israelites were upon their journey towards Jerusalem [and] that they had written to others in their Nation, in Europe and America to encourage and invite them to hasten to them, this seemed to many godly and judicious [people] to be a beginning of that Prophesie [Ezekiel 37:1-14]."[256] Samuel Pepys, reporting on the mood in London, said Jewish bookies were offering 10 to 1 odds in favor of anyone who wanted to put money on whether Zevi was the messiah or not. Pepys' comment indicates the Jews of London were no exception to the rule. The community there had elected Jacob Sasportas as their rabbi, and the otherwise level-headed Sasportas, despite what he said in post-dated documents, did nothing to oppose the notion the messiah had come to restore the Kingdom of Israel. The rabbis of Jerusalem who could have pulled the plug on the movement remained silent when the rabbis of Constantinople wrote to ask them to certify Zevi's *bona fides* as the messiah. Unable to contradict the mob, the rabbis of Constantinople joined the messianic madness.

Graetz claims Zevi mania derived additional encouragement from Christian enthusiasts who hoped to bring about the millennium, but that millennialism had burned itself out among all but a few diehard religious fanatics when news of Zevi reached London. Zevi's cause was fostered less by sympathy among the judaizers, most of whom had retired from the scene in disgrace, than by shrewd publicity. One hundred and fifty years after the Jews had made Reuchlin's pamphlet a best-seller and almost 300 years before Eddie Bernays, Sigmund Freud's nephew, would invent the science of public relations, the Jews had become masters in intelligence and the dissemination of information. By collaborating with the Protestants to produce Luther's and Calvin's Bibles, they had mastered the technology of printing; they were now using that technology to announce the long-awaited messiah had come to redeem the Jews.

Samuel Primo, Zevi's private secretary, "took care that reports of the fame and doings of the messiah should reach Jews abroad,"[256] by feeding information into the intelligence network of Jewish spies, English and Dutch mercantile houses, and evangelical ministers that had evolved from Walsingham and Cromwell's spy agencies. Circulars announcing the events in Smyrna flooded London, Hamburg, Amsterdam and all other centers of Jewish influence in Europe. Most of what the Jews were reading came from the pen of Nathan of Gaza, whose letters provided the details of the coming messianic era to begin in 1666. During that year, Nathan wrote, Zevi "will take dominion from the Turkish king without war."[257] By the power of the hymns and praises he would sing, Zevi was going to establish the dominion of Israel over all the nations of the earth. "All nations shall submit to his rule."[258] The Jews of Hamburg who had been listening to impudent German youth blowing trumpets in the night must have felt especially vindicated when they read "there will be no slaughter among the uncircumcised . . . except in German lands,"[259] by

which Nathan probably meant Poland, or the land where the Ashkenazim, or German speaking Jews, had suffered recently.

After disarming the sultan with his songs, Zevi would proceed to Jerusalem, where he would "discover the exact site of the altar as well as the ashes of the red heifer" and "perform sacrifices" although he would not rebuild the temple.[260] Then he would travel east to the banks of the river Sambatyon, which can only be crossed on the Sabbath, when it ceases to flow. After locating the ten lost tribes on its far bank, Zevi "will return from the river Sambatyon, mounted on a celestial lion. . . . At this sight all the nations and all the kings shall bow before him to the ground. On that day the ingathering of the dispersed shall take place, and he shall behold the sanctuary already built descending from above."[261] He will perform the final act of *tiqqun* by "restoring the divine sparks and essences to their rightful place." That, of course, meant "the dissolution of the kingdom of oppression and the end of the external, visible exile" would take place before "one year and some months" had passed.[262]

In a letter written at the end of 1665, Nathan announced that Zevi was the reincarnation of Simon bar Kokhba. Zevi, though, was unable to make up his mind whether he was bar Kokhba or Christ. More than one commentator has noticed the Christian elements that crept into Nathan of Gaza's theology. Jews were asked, for example, to have faith, rather than just to fulfill the law. At a certain point, Nathan announced Zevi was going to redeem Jesus Christ from the pot of boiling excrement to which the Talmud had consigned him for all eternity. It was probably then that Rabbi Sasportas began to doubt Zevi's credentials. "The notion of the salvation of Jesus," Scholem tells us, "whose soul, according to Talmudic tradition, was forever condemned, was particularly offensive to R. Jacob Sasportas."[263]

During Hanukkah, Zevi slipped into manic exaltation and, buoyed by the frenzy his own publicity machine had created, announced on December 14, 1665, that he was the long-expected messiah. The sequence of events bore an uncanny resemblance to the account in Luke 4:16ff, in which Jesus read from Isaiah, "rolled up the scroll" and announced "this text is being fulfilled even as you listen." Jesus, we are told, "was very much in Zevi's mind,"[264] causing him to imitate some of his actions. Instead of just announcing that the messiah had arrived, as Jesus had done, Zevi tried to outdo Christ by taking the Torah scroll in his arms and singing his favorite song, a Castilian love song popular among Ladino exiles in Turkey known as "Meliselda," about the lover who lay with the King's daughter after she got out of her bath tub. The man who lay with the "shining lass/ As she came up from the bath" was none other than Zevi, and his passionate singing infused in his listeners the mystical allegory with such power that "many unlettered men and women experienced all manner of convulsion" and proclaimed "Shabbetai Zevi is the King of Israel."[265] At the end of his performance, Zevi announced he was the Anointed One of God and that the Redemption of Israel would take place on the 15th

of Nisan 5426, which is to say, in the following year. Zevi then dispatched one of his assistants to Constantinople to make preparations for his arrival there.

As if to show the new dispensation had abolished the Old Law, Zevi pronounced the Ineffable Name, ate forbidden foods, encouraged other Jews to do likewise, and did "other things,"[266] most probably involving sexual orgies, things not described in polite company in those days. The coming of the messiah was less the result of a "carefully hatched plot" and more the result of the eruption of irrational forces."[267] Those eruptions soon took place among his followers too because they were empowered to act on their forbidden desires by accepting Zevi as their messiah. He had told them "Blessed is He Who hath permitted things forbidden." Of course, the prospect of unlimited sexual gratification also acted as a powerful stimulant to join the movement. Immanuel Frances captured the mania in a poem:

> Is he the Lord's anointed or a traitor,
> A wicked sinner and a fornicator?
> Forbidden women he embraces;
> As first the one, and then the other he caresses.
> The foolish people, gaping as spellbound,
> Affirm: this is a mystery profound.[268]

The mobilization of sexual passion Zevi achieved through his marriage to the wife of whoredoms and the publicity it generated had its roots in the Zohar, which claimed the messiah would repair the effects of Adam's sin and restore woman to her original freedom. Now that so many agreed that Zevi was the messiah, he found himself riding a tiger of his own creation, a revolutionary movement unfolding under the watchful eyes of the Turkish authorities, who because they were either especially prudent or dumbfounded, allowed the events to unroll unhindered. Or so it seemed until a Jewish delegation dispatched from Constantinople arrived in Smyrna with orders from the Sultan to arrest Zevi. Fortunately for the messiah, by the time they arrived Zevi was gone. On the first day of 1666, Shabbetai Zevi set sail for Constantinople. The voyage, which normally lasted 10 to 14 days, took over a month because of the contrary winds that blew down the Dardanelles. These winds had occasioned the founding of Troy. In this instance, they symbolized the revolutionary passions Zevi aroused but could not control.

Battered by the winds that had enriched Troy, Zevi's ship finally made land on the Dardanelles short of his destination. He was promptly arrested and dragged ashore in chains on February 8, 1666. The Jews who had come to greet him as the messiah fled in panic. Those who didn't flee were beaten by the Turkish guards who waded into the crowd to create a path for their prisoner. Suddenly all the stories about how even the sea had obeyed Zevi on his voyage didn't seem so plausible. Of course, Zevi could have taken another page from the same book that contained the story about the obedient waves

and claimed the messiah had come to suffer and die, but there is no indication the Jews would have gone for that story since they had rejected it the first time around. Mehemed IV's vizier, the shrewd Ahmed Korprulu, had taken charge of this case and would handle it brilliantly.

When Zevi appeared before the Divan, three days after his arrest, he claimed he was nothing more than a humble Jewish Chacham who came to Constantinople to collect alms and could not be held responsible for the imprudent zeal of his followers. Persuaded by his testimony, the deputy vizier Mustapha Pasha, who had welcomed the messiah to Constantinople with a blow to the ear, sentenced Zevi to an indeterminate term in the local prison for Jewish debtors. While in prison, Zevi wrote an open letter to his fellow Jewish prisoners urging them not to default on their debts to English merchants, even if the world was about to end. Defaulters, Zevi wrote, perhaps remembering the English merchants who had frequented his father's house, would have no share in his joy and glory when he ascended his throne in Jerusalem.

A little over two weeks after Zevi had been thrown in prison, the synagogue in Hamburg resolved to send a delegation to Constantinople "to prostrate ourselves, as is fitting, before our king, Shabbetai Sevi."[269] Their response was typical of the synagogues in Europe. The vast majority were swept away in the messianic hysteria, including the one led by Rabbi Jacob Sasportas. "If," Scholem reasoned, "a shrewd, sober and arrogant observer like Sasportas could be carried away. . . then it is not surprising that the Jewish masses saw no reason to doubt the good news. . . salvation was at hand."[270] Thousands of Jews converged on Constantinople to offer homage to their messiah, so many that food prices began to climb as demand outstripped supply. Hundreds of women assembled in Constantinople to prophesy and became so possessed by the spirit that the Turkish authorities had to beat them with whips and clubs to drive them away. The vizier Ahmed Korprulu was a shrewd observer of human nature and religion-inspired follies. With a following as fanatical as this, Shabbetai Zevi was dangerous even in prison. Since the Porte was planning a war with Crete, it had no desire for a simultaneous uprising among the Jews, something that most certainly would have occurred if Korprulu had ordered Zevi's immediate execution. No, the Porte would treat the suffering messiah leniently, and his followers would be lulled into passivity until the *coup de grace* fell.

As a result, Korprulu had Zevi transferred to the fortress of Abydos, a minimum security prison for political prisoners near Gallipoli on the other side of the Dardanelles. Zevi arrived at his new home, which his followers called the Tower of Strength (or *Migdal Oz*), on the day of preparation for Passover. Zevi was allowed to slaughter and cook a Paschal lamb in his quarters. Then, as if to show once again that he was above the law of Moses, Zevi and his followers ate the lamb with its fat, which the Talmud forbids.

After Passover, Zevi and his followers settled into a way of life so bizarre and so disconnected from reality that one must have recourse to works of fantasy like Edgar Allan Poe's *Masque of the Red Death* to find something analogous. Jews from all over Europe continued to arrive in Constantinople to pay homage to the King of the Jews, so many that Zevi's jailer, the governor of the castle of Abydos, was able to double the admission charge without diminishing the stream of visitors. Zevi would receive his visitors sitting on a throne holding a Torah scroll that, like Zevi, was clad in red. The walls of his chamber were covered with carpets of gold. The floor of his cell was covered with rugs of silver and gold. Zevi sat at a table made of silver and covered with gold. He wrote his letters by dipping his pen into an inkstand of gold encrusted with jewels. Whatever he ate or drank was served on vessels of silver and gold, which, like his inkstand, were encrusted with jewels. When he wasn't singing or feasting, Zevi engaged in sexual orgies. The Jews hailed Zevi as their messiah even in prison, because in that prison Zevi had accomplished what the Jews had always wanted their messiah to accomplish. He had created heaven on earth.

Zevi would urge his visitors to eat at the times prescribed for fasting. According to one account, Zevi had a bowl of fruit brought to his visitors, who objected, "How can we eat?" Zevi calmed their scruples by telling them that breaking the law and the fast would "fulfill Scripture."[271] Zevi would then take a gold scarf and wrap it around the neck of the spellbound visiting rabbi and proclaim, "I make you kings in this world. You shall be kings and princes before me." The rabbis responded by proclaiming that they had died and gone to heaven, "for now it seems to us that we are in the celestial paradise."[272]

In August, Zevi celebrated his birthday on the ninth of Ab by abolishing the fast the law had imposed on Jews to commemorate the destruction of the temple. Since the Shekinah was now manifest, Jews no longer needed to fast on the 17th of Tammuz or the 9th of Ab. With his skill at singing and skillful staging, interweaving the erotic and the religious, Zevi had no problem convincing his followers he had created heaven on earth in his prison cell. The tales of those who had visited his fantastic quarters in prison increased his fame and the expectations of his followers. The tension surrounding the anticipated inauguration of his reign had become intolerable in Constantinople. Several dervishes had prophesied the fall of the Turkish Empire and its replacement by the kingdom of the Jews.

Zevi and his followers eagerly awaited the arrival of Nathan of Gaza so that together they could inaugurate the millennium. For thee months, from April to July, Zevi had been leading the life of a prince in his prison cell on the Dardanelles, intent only upon his own apotheosis, which would take place when Nathan of Gaza arrived. But another prophet arrived from another land, and he inaugurated Zevi's downfall rather than his apotheosis.

On September 3, 1666, Rabbi Nehemiah ha-Cohen arrived at Abydos after traveling from Poland. Since many rabbis had arrived in Abydos while Zevi had been imprisoned, nothing seemed amiss when the two closeted themselves in "secret converse."[273] During that conversation, Rabbi Nehemiah announced his own anointing and, failing to convince Zevi to share the messianic honors with him, left Abydos in a rage and went straight to the Pasha in Adrianople, where Rabbi Nehemiah announced Zevi was plotting insurrection. Rabbi Nehemiah was so outraged by his rebuke that he announced to the pasha Mustapha that he wanted to become a Muslim on the spot, leading some to believe he was a Turkish plant. On September 5, he converted to Islam. Shortly afterwards he returned to Poland, put off his turban and "greatly repented,"[274] but by then it was too late to save Zevi from his fate.

On September 15, four messengers from the sultan's court arrived to take Zevi prisoner. The Jewish heaven on earth suddenly burst like a fragile soap bubble. The governor of the prison was abruptly deprived of his lucrative income. The Jews who had thronged to greet their messiah were driven away with blows by the Sultan's soldiers, and Zevi, without even "an hour's space to take solemn farewell of his Followers and Adorers,"[275] was thrown unceremoniously into a closed carriage and driven to the Sultan's court in Adrianople, 150 miles to the northeast.

The idea that Zevi was the messiah had taken such firm root in the mind of his Jewish followers that now they were convinced the moment of his triumph had arrived. The time had come when Zevi was to take the crown from the head of the sultan. After charming him into submission with song, Zevi would place that crown on his own head and inaugurate the kingdom of heaven on earth. Robert de Dreux, a chaplain at the French embassy, recounted later that crowds of Jews ran about spreading carpets over the streets of Adrianople in anticipation of his arrival. When de Dreux gave voice to his skepticism, he was told by an innkeeper's son "there is nothing to scoff at, for before long you will be our slaves by the power of the messiah."[276]

The Turks had lost none of their shrewdness during the months of Zevi's captivity. They knew that Zevi's death would almost certainly mean a rebellion by the Jews, who were already primed for the arrival of Armageddon. After consulting with the sultan's physician, the apostate Jew Mustapha Fawzi Hayati Zade, the Turks came up with a better strategy. Dragged before the divan, Zevi was given an opportunity to prove he was indeed the messiah. Zevi was to be stripped naked and tied to a post outside the gate of the seraglio, where the sultan's archers would shoot arrows at him. If he were indeed the messiah, the arrows would not harm him. If he were unsure of whether he were the messiah and, therefore, unwilling to undergo the test, there was a simpler alternative. Zevi could become a Muslim. It didn't take Zevi long to decide. Faced with either death or apostasy, Zevi chose apostasy. The Jewish messiah fell to his knees and begged the sultan to accept him as

a convert. For emphasis, Zevi "threw his [Jewish] hat down and spat on it and reviled the Jewish religion, publicly desecrating the name of Heaven."[277] He then "slandered and denounced his faithful believers."[278] Impressed with Zevi's zeal for his new religion, the sultan changed Zevi's name to his own, calling him Mehmed Effendi and granted him a pension of 150 piatres per day as *kapici bahsi* or keeper of the palace gates. To prove his sincerity in adopting his new faith, Zevi agreed to take one of the queen's slave girls as an additional wife. Sarah didn't seem upset by this arrangement. She was, according to Scholem, "already familiar with the experience of outwardly professing another religion"[279] because of her days in Poland. Under the tutelage of the sultan's mother, Zevi's wife apostatized too, taking the name Fatima Cadin.

According to the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, the apostasy of the man the overwhelming number of synagogues in Europe had acknowledged as the messiah was the greatest catastrophe to strike the Jewish people since the destruction of the Temple. Because of the time lag inherent in communication then, letters were still arriving from Europe offering homage to the failed Jewish messiah a month after his apostasy. On October 9, 1666, the day of Atonement, the Jews of Hamburg pronounced a five-fold blessing over his name. The rabbis of Amsterdam, afflicted by the same time lag, sent a letter of homage that arrived at the time of his apostasy. Like Cromwell, Zevi tried to shift the blame for his apostasy onto God. A few days after his conversion, Zevi explained in a letter to one of his brothers, "God has made me an Ishmaelite."[280]

Gradually, word of Zevi's apostasy trickled back to Europe during the fall of 1666. On November 10, 1666 Henry Oldenburg wrote he had just received news from Amsterdam that "the King of the Jews was turned Turk."[281] He noted that "our Jews"[282] didn't believe the news, but by December, news of the apostasy was accepted as undeniably true. Jews who not long before had warned Christians that the tables would soon be turned when Zevi ascended his throne, now had to endure the scorn of Muslims and Christians who ridiculed them mercilessly as blind and credulous fools. Now that Zevi had been marginalized, the sultan could move against the Jews of Turkey with impunity, which he did by having 50 rabbis executed:

> Repression was the most common Jewish response to Zevi's apostasy. The rabbis of Constantinople threatened to expel from the synagogue anyone who even pronounced Zevi's name, and, as if that weren't enough, threatened to hand violators of the ban over to Turkish authorities once they had been expelled. Conversion to Christianity was another response. Jakob Melammed, who taught at a school run by the Ashkenazi community in Hamburg, converted with his family in 1676 when he realized "the noise which the Jews had made about their Shabbetai Zevi, for which we had waited for a whole year with fasts and mortifications

was all lies." Zevi's apostasy "had aroused in him the first doubts about the Jewish religion."[283]

Docetism was another common response, especially among followers of the Cabala. Zevi, according to this explanation, hadn't really converted to Islam. A phantom that resembled Zevi had converted, but the real Zevi had repaired to the vicinity of the Ten Lost Tribes and was even then preparing to lead them back to Jerusalem. Nathan of Gaza claimed Zevi's conversion presented a deep mystery whose meaning Nathan would reveal shortly. Samuel Primo, Zevi's spin doctor, claimed Zevi had undergone a "mock conversion," and that Zevi's duplicity proved he was the real messiah, because like Moses at Pharaoh's court he was "outwardly sinful" but "inwardly pure."[284]

There was, of course, historical precedent for Zevi's actions. Zevi was a Sephardic Jew living in Turkey speaking a Spanish dialect precisely because so many of his ancestors had gone through the motions of converting to another religion, while all the while holding onto Judaism in secret, so why shouldn't he do the same? There was, however, no Biblical or theological justification for this behavior. No matter what excuses the rabbis of the post-Christian era concocted, the Biblical paradigm for Jewish behavior remained the aged Eleazar in the book of Maccabbees, who chose death rather than violate the Law of Moses by eating pork. Shabbetai Zevi because of his apostasy became the paradigm of a new Jew, the subversive Jew, willing to lie to save his life and then subvert his new faith in the name of the one he ostensibly had renounced, while claiming he was really subverting his old faith in the name of the new.

After his apostasy, Zevi became a double agent who was so skillful that no one could tell where his real allegiance, if he had any, lay. Many Jews, we are told, "flocked in, some from as far as from Babylon, Jerusalem and other remote places and casting their caps on the ground, in presence of the Grand Signior, voluntarily professed themselves Mahometans."[285] De la Croix reports he saw Zevi in the company of apostate Jews, "who followed him to the synagogues where he preached conversion to Islam with such success that during the five years or so that the mission of the zealot for the religion of Mahomet lasted, the number of Turks [that is, Jewish apostates to Islam] increased every day."[286] Leyb ben Ozer claims Zevi "caused more than three hundred Jews to apostatize in the course of two or three months."[287]

On the other hand, there were also stories of Zevi sitting with the Koran in one hand and the Torah scroll in the other. Tobias Rofe claims that in addition to doing "queer things," sometimes Zevi "prayed and behaved like a Jew and sometimes like a Muslim."[288] It was impossible to tell whether he was a Muslim subverting Jews or a Jew subverting Muslims; Zevi stood for subversion more than for any religious creed. Everything about him bespoke, in Rycaut's words, "disguise and dissimulation."[289] Zevi had become the quintessential subversive Jew and a paradigm for other subversive Jews for

centuries to come. In Zevi the converso tradition found its apotheosis. Zevi, according to Rycaut, "passed his days in the Turkish Court as some time Moses did in that of the Egyptians."[290] According to Graetz, "He played the part of the Jew at one time, of Mussulman at another."[291] If Zevi became aware Turkish spies were listening to him preach, he would throw off his Jewish headdress and put on the turban. When speaking to Jews, Zevi would claim "he only persisted in Mahometanism in order to bring thousands and tens of thousands of non-Jews over to Israel. To the sultan and the mufti, on the other hand, he said his approximation to the Jews was intended to bring them over to Islam."[292] So in an atmosphere in which it became impossible to tell what he really believed, Zevi came to represent universal subversion. Before long his followers, schooled in duplicity, rationalized what Scholem calls their "double-faced existence."[293] Those rabbis still sympathetic to Zevi's claims allowed the Sabbatians to dissemble and "thereby to risk unnecessary persecution." While denouncing "active dissimulation and deceit," the same rabbis condoned the "'holy deceit' practiced by Shabbetai Zevi and those who apostatized at his behest. This act of deceit was part of the tactics of warfare against the demonic powers of the *qellippah*, and hence of a different order altogether."[294]

Just as the North African rabbis condoned insincere conversion, Zevi's followers condoned deceit, as long as it was holy. These rationalizations took root in the Jewish character and produced what Kant termed "a nation of deceivers." Graetz attributes that unfortunate characteristic to the influence that Talmudic studies exerted over Polish Jews. The story of Shabbetai Zevi, especially when seen as the culmination of the converso drama in Spain, indicates that the tradition goes back much farther. It was fostered by the Sabbatians who "were second to none in the art of interpreting, hairsplitting, and twisting texts, for which the Jews forever have had such an uncontested reputation."[295]

Zevi's apostasy and his subsequent career as a double agent contributed significantly to the rise of the Jew as a subversive because, as Scholem puts it, Zevi's apostasy, "unlike the passion and death of Jesus" was "essentially destructive of all values."[296] Zevi's apologists could find justification for their deceit in the Cabala, which talks about "the dialectical liquidation of evil" which "appears to strengthen the power of evil before its final defeat" and "requires not only the disguise of good in the form of evil but total identification with it."[297] Scholem says "it was along such lines that the subsequent theology of the Sabbatian radicals developed,"[298] without mentioning Marxism, but the connections are obvious. Sabbatian practice remained consistent with the theology of the Lurianic Cabala, which was "not content with the defeat and submission of gentiles but exulted in the idea of their ultimate annihilation."[299] The apostasy of Shabbetai Zevi did not change that goal, but it did give moral respectability to deceit as a way to achieve that goal. The Jews were subversives

because their messiah had become a subversive, as the following parable made clear:

> the king (that is, God) . . . sends his trusted servant (that is, the messiah) as a spy into the enemy country to inquire about the captives. The servant has to act with great cunning "and to adopt the dress of the people through whose land he passes, and to behave as they do, lest they notice that he is a spy. . . . Keep this parable in your heart, for it is a foundation to satisfy you regarding severe doubts in the matter."[300]

No matter how hard the Sabbatians tried to justify their messiah's apostasy, Rabbinic Judaism could not survive a cataclysm of this magnitude unscathed. The shock was so great that Rabbinic Judaism split down the middle. Having failed to achieve in Maimonides the synthesis of faith and reason that Aquinas forged for Catholicism, Rabbinic Judaism tended to split along the fault lines of faith and reason because it was unable to withstand the shock of Zevi's apostasy and remain whole. From this moment forward, Jews would choose either faith or reason without being able to reconcile either to the other. The mantle of reason fell to Spinoza, who collaborated with the rejecters of religion to bring forth the Enlightenment. The mantle of faith fell to the Hasidim, who established their isolated pietistic communities in the *shtetls* of Poland and later the Pale of the Settlement in Russia.

The cataclysm that followed Zevi's apostasy also led to what Meyer Abrams calls "natural supernaturalism." Gershom Scholem provides a good example when he writes Zevi's apostasy "contained the seeds of a new Jewish consciousness."[301] The heart of this new consciousness lay in the recognition that "it was not he [Zevi] who made the messianic movement, but the faith of the masses which, in an explosive discharge of messianic energies accumulated during many generations, swept him to the heights of messiahship."[302] Since the Jewish people were the ultimate source of this energy, they, not the messiah, held the ultimate power. Out of the wreckage of Zevi's apostasy, the Jews slowly came to understand that "the Jewish people must become its own messiah."[303] Toward the end of the 19th century Jews chose to worship themselves as their own messiah under the form of Zionism or Marxism. According to Scholem's reading of the Zevi tragedy, the important thing was not Zevi and his failed promises, but that "for the first time since the destruction of the Temple," a "national revival" had "aroused the entire Jewish people."[304] Although this revival had been based on either a lie or a delusion, Scholem claims the important thing was the revival itself. "A unique chance of a mighty renewal seemed to present itself, and the well-nigh unanimous response indicated that the seed had not been sown in vain."[305] As long as the Jews "rediscovered pride and new self-consciousness," it didn't matter that the movement was based on an illusion or that "their behavior does not live up to our ideas of revolutionary leadership."[306] In other words, if everyone believes in the illusion, it stops being an illusion. This sounds like a good explanation of

stock market bubbles but not religious movements. In both kinds of bubble, experience becomes more important than reality. "Who cares if Zevi was a coward, a fraud, and a subversive?," Scholem seems to say. As long as he united the Jewish people, his lies were as real as anything else, because the ultimate reality is "inward vision":

> Their faith in the messiah was nourished not on outward events but on the inward vision of their souls. Why then should the verdict of outward events undo the affirmation of their messianic experience? The signs of redemption had been clearly visible to all who had eyes to see. Should they now be written off as a nightmarish illusion?[307]

Once again, Jews were confronted with a choice because "the naive and simple oneness of the original messianic faith"[308] had been destroyed. The Jew could now choose "nightmarish illusion" or "disenchanting outer reality" because "the two notions which had hitherto been held to be aspects of one and the same reality now fell apart as each began to lead its own, independent life."[309] According to Scholem, "a considerable part of Jewry did, in fact, prefer the reality of their heart's vision above that of the disenchanting outer reality." For them, "historical reality became mere illusion, and only the incontestable inner reality was truly real."[310] For the followers of Karl Marx, the opposite was true. Spiritual reality became an illusion and the only reality was history and economic forces. No matter where he looked in the aftermath of the Zevi catastrophe, the Jew was confronted with dualism, forced to choose one of two repugnant alternatives.

Undeterred by Zevi's apostasy, Nathan of Gaza continued to follow Zevi's commands. Like many true believers, Nathan felt Zevi was still the messiah even if "he had to disguise himself for a while for the better success at the execution of his great design."[311] And so on the explicit instructions of the Apostate messiah, Nathan of Gaza set out on a secret cabalistic mission to Rome, where he was to "perform a mystico-magical rite and to bring about the destruction of the city."[312] In March 1668, Nathan landed in Venice, where he told the Jews he was on a "divine errand" to Rome "on behalf of the whole congregation of Israel."[313] Wary of Nathan in the wake of the Zevi debacle, the Jews had Nathan deported before he caused more problems.

When Nathan arrived in Rome, he shaved his beard and put on a disguise. Then he and his companion Samuel Condor made their way before dawn to the Castel Sant'Angelo, where he chanted curses and then threw into the Tiber a scroll inscribed in the language of the Chaldeans which predicted the fall of Rome, *i.e.*, the Catholic Church, within the coming year. Satisfied his mission had been accomplished, Nathan and Condor then repaired to Leghorn, where he told the Jews what he had done. While in Leghorn, Nathan kept a low profile, confining his preaching to the private homes of believers because "Sabbatian preaching was going underground."[314]

Scholem says Nathan's secret mission to Rome was a symbolic imitation of Zevi's apostasy. Just as Zevi "had entered the Sultan's palace and the realm of Ishmael,"[315] so Nathan performed a magical rite around the Pope's palace to bring about its destruction. The messiah and the prophet, despite appearances to the uninitiated, were laboring at the heart of the *qelippah* to bring about the final *tiqqun*. Bakan says Sigmund Freud was influenced by Zevi's example, that Freud modeled his career of subversion on that of the apostate messiah.[316] Both Zevi and Freud shared a fixation on Rome, which confirms Rome's role in establishing the continuity of the Jewish revolutionary project.

Rome was no stranger to catastrophe, but nothing catastrophic occurred in 1669 as the result of Nathan of Gaza's Chaldean curses. Zevi continued his subversive ways undeterred by the failure of the curse to cause the fall of Rome. In September 1672, Zevi was arrested in a synagogue for converting Muslims to Judaism. Zevi and his followers were again dragged in chains before the vizier Korprulu. And once again Zevi dissembled because there was as much evidence he was leading Jews to Islam as there was that he was leading Muslims to Judaism. Two years later, Moses Harari arrived in Leghorn. Harari had apostatized from Judaism to Islam under Zevi's tutelage. Now living in a non-Muslim country, he had returned to Judaism with a distinctly "double-faced" Sabbatian cast. "To the unbelievers he said that the Sabbatian faith was all lies and falsehoods, 'but in secret he went to the believers, exhorting them to persevere in their faith and [assuring them] that all he said to the unbelievers was untrue . . . and was merely said for the sake of security.'"[317] So what was one to believe? The Sabbatians were like the man from Crete who said all Cretans were liars.

By 1674, Zevi had exhausted the patience of the Sultan, who imprisoned him in the fortress of Dulcigno on the Adriatic coast in Montenegro near the Albanian border. Sarah, whom Zevi had divorced in 1671, was allowed to rejoin her husband, and together they tried to resurrect the fool's paradise they had created in Abydos eight years earlier. There were no Jews in Dulcigno, so Zevi rode out the cycles of his manias and depressions without an audience. Zevi died there in September 1676, at age 50, one day short of the tenth anniversary of his apostasy. Baruch Spinoza died less than six months later, his death most probably hastened by glass dust he inhaled during his years as a lens grinder. Scholem said the Zevi apostasy burst the walls of the ghetto. The opposite, though, is the case. Judaism retreated once again, as in the wake of Julian's disastrous attempt to rebuild the temple, behind the *shtetl* walls into an ethnocentric reverie. Doubt, however, "regarding the accepted wisdom of rabbinic leadership crept into the edges of Jewish thought."[318] It would not take a millennium for revolutionary fervor to break out anew. The Jews would be swept into revolutionary fervor once again a little over a century after Zevi's death.

Chapter Thirteen

The Rise of Freemasonry

In 1605 Francis Bacon published *The Advancement of Learning*. To write on the new science without mentioning John Dee, who was still alive, was either a calculated insult or an attempt to stay out of trouble. There is no evidence of personal animus in Bacon's dealings with Dee, so avoiding trouble must have been Bacon's goal. Bacon must have been aware Dee had petitioned for support from the new Scottish king, and had been coldly rebuffed. King James I thought that Dee was a sorcerer and had made his feelings toward sorcerers and witches clear in *Demonology*, published in 1597. Given the vehemence of the king's feelings about those who trafficked in spirits, Dee was lucky that he wasn't burned at the stake. Instead Dee was condemned to internal banishment from the court whose interests he had served so faithfully as a magus and spy. If Shakespeare had written a play about Dee's life, it would have been a tragedy. Some feel Shakespeare wrote not one play about Dee, but two. Dee was most certainly Prospero in his mastery of potent spells and arcane gnosis gathered from ancient books, but he was also Lear raging poor and almost mad at the end of his life against a country that treated him so ungratefully. Bacon, attempting a project dangerously similar to what Dee proposed, was careful to ensure the same thing didn't happen to him.

Dee's main service to queen and country was his mission to Prague, which began in 1583. Walsingham sent Dee to Prague to exploit Emperor Rudolph II's craving for occult knowledge to bring him under the control of Cecil and Elizabeth in their cabal against Philip II, and to thwart the Jesuits and the Hapsburgs, who were turning Prague into a bulwark of the Counter Reformation and a center for English Catholic exiles who wanted to restore Philip II to the throne. After waiting impatiently for three years for results from Dee's mission, Elizabeth had herself declared head of the Protestant conspiracy at a meeting in Lueneburg in July 1586. Elizabeth then sent emissaries to a secret Protestant conventical where she proposed a military league that would include her and the kings of Denmark and Navarre. Queen Elizabeth assumed primacy because of her resources. The meeting is

mentioned in Simon Studion's *Naometria*, one of the standard Rosicrucian texts of the early 17th century, mentioned by Andreae and others.

Emboldened by the meeting, Elizabeth sided with the hard-liners who wanted to take the war to the Catholics in the Netherlands, which was perceived as the weakest link in the Hapsburg chain. Six months after her meeting, Leicester launched his intervention in the Netherlands, coming to the aid of the Dutch Calvinists, with the help of his young cousin, the paragon of Elizabethan Protestant chivalry, Sir Philip Sidney. The military campaign of 1586 was a disaster. Sidney died in battle, and English hopes of a Protestant military victory on the continent died with him. The English could dominate the seas, as the defeat of the Spanish Armada would show, but her armies were no match for the Duke of Parma, who would soon retake Antwerp. As Christopher Dawson noted, if Philip had waited for Parma to take Holland before launching the Armada, European history would have been very different.

By 1589, Dee knew his mission to the continent was a failure. However, he decided to take the long way home and conducted what seemed a triumphal progress through the Germanies, spreading his views among devotees of the Cabala. Dee's fame in Germany was considerable. His *Monas Hieroglyphica* had taken occult Hermetic Cabalism to a new level, and many followers of Reuchlin and Agrippa wanted to meet Dee. In June 1589, Dee was in Bremen ready to return to England when he received a visit from "that famous Hermetique Philosopher Dr. Henricus Khunrath of Hamburgh."[1] Khunrath was author of the *Amphitheatre of Eternal Wisdom*, which provides a crucial link between Dee and the Rosicrucian movement. So crucial was the link that Yates says Dee "sowed the seeds for the subsequent Rosicrucian movement on his journey back to England in 1589."[2]

Paradoxically, Dee's failure was more successful than if he had converted Rudolph: the movement outlasted Rudolph's reign and continued as a secret society when the Counter Reformation most certainly would have crushed any public organization. According to Yates, freemasonry was one stream that flowed from Rosicrucianism, and the Royal Society another. Once again, the revolutionary movement found refuge in England, where it weathered the storm that all but destroyed it on the continent. Dee would never see the fruits of his labors. Nor would posterity recognize him for his achievement. Indeed, the Restoration that gave England the masonic lodge and the Royal Society buried Dee under a mountain of opprobrium in 1659 when Meric Casaubon published Dee's diaries along with a "damning preface. . . accusing Dee of diabolical magic."[3] Casaubon was following in the footsteps of Francis Bacon. Both men needed to distance themselves from the source of their ideas.

If a great scientist must possess public relations acumen to be known to posterity, then Bacon was clearly a greater scientist than Dee. Bacon cleverly expressed his involvement in the Hermetic/Cabalist tradition only in allegorical

writings published after his death in 1626. Among the papers he withheld from publication was an allegorical travel narrative, *The New Atlantis*, in which English sailors contact an advanced civilization on Bensalem, an island off the coast of Peru. The inhabitants of the island are Christians of a peculiar sort. The officials who greet English travelers wear white turbans "with a small red cross on the top,"[4] indicating the land of the Rosicrucian brotherhood. Like the brothers of the Rosy Cross, the inhabitants of Bensalem "wear no special habit or distinguishing mark but to conform in dress and appearance with the inhabitants of whatever country they were visiting."[5] Yates concludes it is "abundantly clear" Bacon "knew the Rose Cross fiction and was adapting it to his own parable."[6] As further proof of Bacon's link with the Rosicrucians, she cites John Heydon's *Holy Guide*, a 1662 adaptation of *The New Atlantis*, in which a man wearing the white turban announces: "I am by Office Governour of this House of Strangers and by vocation I am a Christian priest and of the Order of the Rosie Cross."[7]

Internal evidence suggests Bacon wrote *The New Atlantis* in the aftermath of Dee's failed mission to Prague. Unlike the *Faerie Queene*, which celebrates Elizabeth as the Protestant savior in the flush of first hope, *The New Atlantis* is veiled and cautious, more suited to an age when the Counter Reformation was triumphing across the continent. Bacon knew which side was winning and had no desire to immolate himself on the altar of a lost cause. Dee's Cabalistic British imperialism no longer found favor at the court, and so those who wanted to carry on the Protestant conspiracy in the absence of royal approval had to go underground to do so, through the formation of a secret society, which at this point came to be known as the Brothers of the Rosy Cross or the Rosicrucians, but which would later be known as freemasonry.

Dodd claims Bacon founded the Lodge in England in 1579. This would make Bacon the founder of freemasonry in England because "there was no lodge of Freemasons in England prior to 1579."[8] Dodd says

> The Ritual is couched in Elizabethan English. The making of our modern tongue began with Spenser, one of Francis Bacon's Masks. And in the Spenser works are at last two allusions to the Square and the Compasses which appear to have a masonic significance. This suspicion grows into a certainty when we examine some letters that were written in 1579 and published in 1580 between Professor Gabriel Harvey and his friend Francis Bacon who signed himself "*Immerito.*"[9]

In a book Bacon published seven years later, the two pillars of masonry are portrayed and between them the motto "*Plus Ultra*," or "More Beyond," for the first time in English literature.[10] Dodd also claims Bacon founded the Rosicrucians on the Continent as

> a reorganization of the old Kings Templar Order and took over primarily their Nine Degree Ceremonial which was associated with the new

> "Rosicrucian College." These Colleges were to be established later and attached as an inner rite to the projected Masonic Brotherhood when established. That is exactly their procedure today. No one can become a member of a Rosicrucian College unless he is a Master mason."

A certain segment of Europe was avid to hear what Bacon had to say because Europe had already been wracked by a century of religious strife. By 1605 it was heading into another century of even worse strife, soon to commence with the outbreak of the Thirty Years War. Freemasonry provided an alternative to sectarian strife; some felt it provided an antidote too. The Lodge proposed "ethics in place of creeds, acts of simple goodness in place of credulous belief, square conduct instead of hypocrisy and chicanery, love and brotherhood instead of the hatred that was sundering the church of Christ."[12] Dodd claims Bacon was the author of the Rosicrucian Manifestos that appeared on the continent. He also claims the real title of *The New Atlantis* was *The Land of the Rosicrucians*. He also claims the House of Salomon was the forerunner of the Invisible College, Gresham College, the Academie, and ultimately the Royal Society. All of those behind the founding of the Royal Society—Fludd, Boyle, Wren, Ashmole, Locke, and Sir Thomas Moray—were Freemasons and Rosicrucians. *The New Atlantis* is thus "the key to the modern rituals of freemasonry."[13]

The connections all point to Jewish science, or Cabala, as the one thing these institutions had in common with the inhabitants of the New Atlantis. The inhabitants of Bensalem hold the Jews in high regard because they are the source of scientific knowledge. They call their college Salomon's house "and seek for God in nature"[14] by using the Cabala as the key that reveals the secrets of nature. Despite Bacon's reputation as the founder of empirical science, Yates sees *The New Atlantis* as "profoundly influenced by Hebraic-Christian mysticism, as in Christian Cabala. The inhabitants of New Atlantis respect the Jews; they call their college after Solomon and seek for God in nature. The Hermetic-Cabalist tradition has borne fruit in their great college devoted to scientific enquiry. . . . The inhabitants of New Atlantis would appear to have achieved the great instauration of learning and have therefore returned to the state of Adam in Paradise before the Fall—the objective of advancement for both Bacon and for the authors of the Rosicrucian Manifestos."[15]

After quarantine in the House of Strangers, the English explorers are introduced to Salomon's House, which is a combination of the modern university and an early version of the CIA. Bensalem is "a land of magicians,"[16] which, like England when Dee and Walsingham spied on Catholics on the continent, "sent forth spirits of the air into all parts, to bring them news and intelligence of other countries."[17] The English travelers "were apt enough to think there was somewhat supernatural in this island; but yet rather as

angelical than magical."[18] Again, the reference is to England, the island nation whose magus John Dee reputedly could summon angels to do his bidding.

Salomon's House, named after "the King of the Hebrews,"[19] proposes a science that is not empirical but rather distinctly Jewish or cabalistic. The residents of Bensalem "esteem [Salomon] as the lawgiver of our nation." To recognize the preeminence of this "King of the Hebrews" over Christ, Bensalem has erected Salomon's House as "the noblest foundation. . . that was ever upon the earth" as well as "the lanthorn of this Kingdom." Salomon's House "is dedicated to the study of the Works and Creatures of God" as written down by Salomon. That includes:

> some parts of his works which with you are lost; namely, that Natural History which he wrote, of all plants, from the cedar of Libanus to the moss that groweth out of the wall and of all things that have life and motion. This maketh me think that our king, find[eth] himself to symbolize in many things with that king of the Hebrews (which lived many years before him).[20]

Salomon's house is sometimes called "the College of the Six Days' Works," indicating the object of its study is creation or nature "whereby I am satisfied that our excellent kind hath learned from the Hebrews that God had created the world and all that therein is within six days; and therefore he instituted that House for the finding out of the true nature of all things."[21]

Salomon's House is also an intelligence operation. The rulers of New Atlantis, like Walsingham with his Jewish spy network on the Continent, would, every 12 years, send

> forth out of this kingdom two ships, appointed to several voyages that in either of these ships there should be a mission of three of the Fellows or Brethren of Salomon's House, whose errand was only to give us knowledge of the affairs and state of those countries to which they were designed, and especially of the science, arts, manufactures and inventions of all the world.[22]

Like England, Bensalem's people are "happy" not only because they study Jewish science but also because they give refuge to the Jews and have incorporated their "secret Cabala"[23] into their constitution. The Jews are so happy they no longer "hate the name of Christ,"[24] as in Catholic Spain. The Jews are so grateful at the tolerant treatment they have received in Bensalem that they have even given up the "secret inbred rancour" they usually feel "against the people amongst whom they live."[25] The Jews of Bensalem "love the nation of Bensalem extremely." They even believe the inhabitants of Bensalem "were of the generations of Abraham by another son, whom they call Nachoran; and that Moses by a secret Cabala ordained the laws of Bensalem which they now use; and that when the messiah should come and sit in his throne at Hierusalem the king of Bensalem should sit at his feet, whereas other kings

should keep a great distance. But yet setting aside these Jewish dreams, the man was a wise man, and learned and of great policy."[26]

Bacon thus launches the myth of the British Israelites and adverts to the idea that society should be based on the Noachide Law, i.e., Jewish law applied to righteous non-Jews, an idea popular among 18th century masonic lodges. Bacon also felt re-admission of the Jews would be beneficial for England. A major benefit would be widespread promotion of Cabala, revealing the mysteries of nature to the Gentiles. The main benefit, however, was Jewish science's "wonderful" technology, which the inhabitants of Bensalem used to create heaven on earth. That technology is revealed when "one of the Fathers of Salomon's house" gives the travelers a tour of "large and deep caves of several depths," used for "all coagulations, indurations, refrigerations and conservations of bodies." The caves are also used "for prolongation of life."[27]

The residents of Bensalem also have "means to make diverse plants rise by mixtures of earths without seeds,"[28] as well as "harmonies which you have not, of quarter sounds, and lesser slides of sounds," and "ships and boats for going under water and brooking of seas; also swimming girdles and supporters." They have "diverse curious clocks and other like motions of return and some perpetual motions."[29] In their intelligence operation, they have "houses of deceits of the senses,"[30] probably an early version of television, which is deceptive in many senses of the word.

In addition to "Mystery Men," who "collect the experiments of all mechanical arts," the rulers of Bensalem have appointed 12 "Merchants of Light," who, fortified by knowledge of Cabala, "sail into foreign countries" and spread Enlightenment.[31] These Merchants of Light gained significance in the 18th century when the Whigs took Baconian science and combined it with the mathematical cosmology of Newton and then promoted this mixture as the Enlightenment. Promoters of the Whig Enlightenment would travel to the continent, especially Holland, where they linked up with Huguenot exiles in an attempt to topple the Bourbon dynasty in France. The Whigs used freemasonry and the Newtonian science of the Royal Society against the Bourbons in the same way Walsingham and Elizabeth had used Dee's angelic technology against the Hapsburgs. Bacon's *New Atlantis* links both campaigns. Bacon's allegory explicates the masonic core at the heart of British foreign policy from the accession of Queen Elizabeth to the French Revolution, when the Enlightenment spun out of control.

Walsh sees in *The New Atlantis* "an allegory of masonry, for the benefit of a few of the elect."[32] To the unsuspecting, "with no information about secret societies," Bacon's allegory "would seem a harmless tale to pass away the time." But to those who were or aspired to be adepts, Bacon provides a wealth of information about the "possible Jewish origin of the Craft, its direction by certain of the Sephardic Jews posing as Catholics in Spain, the hierarchical organization, with wheels within wheels, inner circles almost completely

unknown directing the activities of the innocent novices, the elaborate spy system, the use of great wealth to gain power under cover of philanthropic and scientific purposes, the oath of secrecy concealing matters which it would not be healthy to reveal to the general public."[33] Bacon also explains to the initiate "the far-flung system of intrigue and espionage"[34] Walsingham started and Walpole used to inject subversive ideas into France during the first half of the 18th century. Walsh uses Bacon's allegory to link the Whig Freemasonry of the Walpole era with the anti-Catholic conspiracy confected by Elizabeth, Walsingham, and Cecil, claiming freemasonry is "one of the instruments used by the rulers of England to undermine the powers of France."[35] The work that began with Dee's occult assault on Spain culminated two centuries later when the Whig-inspired masonic lodges brought down the Bourbon dynasty and ushered in the French Revolution. "There is much evidence," he continues, "that something like this secret society, or at least its parent organization existed in the 16th century, and had a great deal to do with coordinating the international conspiracy against the Catholic Church."[36] According to Bacon's allegory, America is the old Atlantis, a continent lost to the civilized nations when its inhabitants lost contact with the judaizers from Bensalem. Bacon implies the loss is temporary. Once Cabala under the guise of freemasonry returns to America, the old Atlantis will again thrive.

The standard history of freemasonry as beginning with the formation of the Grand Lodge in 1717 is Whig history in every sense of the term. For political reasons, Anderson's *Constitutions* deliberately obscured the real history of the Craft, causing consternation among scholars who could not make sense of historical documents that proved the lodge existed at least a century before. One document showed that the first American lodge was created in Newport, Rhode Island, in 1658, when 15 Jewish families migrated from Holland. That and the colonization of the Massachusetts Bay Colony by English judaizers would ensure America became the "new Jewish wonder world"[37] in the 20th century. Protestant revolution in England would be fulfilled in socialist revolution in Russia four centuries later. That revolution found supporters in America, most of whom were Jews. And the children of disaffected Trotskyites would forge yet another vehicle for Revolution by appropriating America as the messianic anti-communist nation. But the trajectory set in motion by judaizing Protestants would find its fulfillment in Cabalistic freemasonry before it would find it in Jewish Socialism, described by an American Jew as "the most glorious page in the story of the Jewish people since the destruction of the Second Temple at the hands of Titus."[38] The Jewish socialists of the early 20th century saw World War I as one more apocalyptic "day of deliverance" which

> finally heaves in sight, and amidst the anguish and suffering of a great world war, the harrowing effect of which no part of the globe is permitted

> to escape, mankind experiences a new birth, and the Jew, too, at last is about to come into his own. . . A new day is at hand when the weak and the oppressed of the earth will find themselves permanently delivered. . . . The beginning of this complete emancipation has already been made in the wonderful change in the status of six million Jews wrought over night, as it were, by the Russian Revolution.[39]

The crucial link between the Protestant and communist revolutionary eras was freemasonry. In 1613, Elizabeth, daughter of James Stuart, King of England, married Frederick V, Elector of the Palatinate. The wedding had a fairy-tale quality. Shakespeare staged a performance of *The Tempest* on their betrothal night of December 27, 1612. The choice of plays was exquisitely appropriate, for many saw in the young island princess the rebirth of the magical cabalistic crusade of her namesake against the Catholic powers of the continent. When the couple sailed from Margate for the Hague, Protestant hopes sailed with them.

After a month in Holland, the young couple set out by boat to Heidelberg, in the now Protestant Palatinate, their new home. When they sailed for Holland many hoped the Counter Reformation, which was massing its forces to extinguish the last smoldering embers of the Protestant conflagration, might not have the last word after all. A couple this attractive and well-connected might well take up Elizabeth's banner, no matter how unwilling the current occupant of the English throne seemed. James, however, had no intention of being drawn into a suicidal attack on Hapsburg hegemony in central Europe or of resurrecting a black operation created by the people who had murdered his mother. James wanted an England at peace. So after marrying Elizabeth to a Protestant prince, he arranged to have one of his sons marry a Spanish Catholic princess. Elizabeth and Frederick's belief that James would continue the quixotic foreign policy of the same group of people who murdered his mother was a miscalculation of enormous proportions that would have disastrous consequences for the Protestant cause.

In June 1613, the young couple arrived at Heidelberg, which continued the festivities begun six months earlier in London. Huge festival arches were erected. English players, who travelled frequently back and forth between Protestant capitals on the Thames and the Rhine, performed plays and masques. For the next six years, Heidelberg was the capital of the reborn Anti-Catholic Conspiracy and a haven for the Cabalism Dee had spread throughout Germany in 1589. It also became a center for cabalistic technology. The Vitruvian architect and engineer Salomon de Caus turned the royal gardens at Heidelberg into a cross between Prospero's magical island and the New Atlantis. The gardens at Heidelberg castle became famous for fountains that played music and for a statue of Memnon, derived from the pneumatics of Hero of Alexander, which seemed to speak or sing when the sun shone on it.

It was a striking application of the cabalistic technology Bacon praised in *The New Atlantis*. In Heidelberg the promise of heaven on earth through cabalistic technology seemed on its way to fulfillment not in allegory but in fact.

During those six years, Johan Valentin Andreae published an important Rosicrucian text, *The Chemical Wedding of Christian Rosencreutz*, which may have been based on Elizabeth and Frederick's life at Heidelberg. *The Chemical Wedding* describes a young married couple living in a marvelous castle of magical wonders. The lion, Frederick's heraldic sign as king of the Palatinate, was a main symbol of the book. Christian Rosencreutz finds that, after entering the castle and participating in ceremonies and initiations, his soul rises to mystical marriage with his Creator in ways vaguely reminiscent of the promises held out by initiation into the higher degrees of freemasonry. Andreae's *Chemical Wedding* represented Dee's Monas on its title page, which leads Yates to conclude "the Rosicrucian movement in Germany was the delayed result of Dee's mission in Bohemia over 20 years earlier."[40] The Rosicrucians, Yates continues, were going to "bring about the return to the golden age of Adam and Saturn through the ceremonies and initiations described in Andreae's *Chemical Wedding of Christian Rosencreutz*."[41] The term Rosicrucian was itself a German appropriation of the symbol of the Knight of the Red Cross from Spenser's Elizabethan epic, *The Faerie Queen*. Spenser got the symbol from the House of Tudor, whose symbol was the red rose. Rosicrucianism was the name Christian Cabala took during the second decade of the 17th century.

If the young couple were looking to fight for the Protestant cause, events soon granted their wish. In 1617, the year in which Robert Fludd's Rosicrucian *magnum opus*, *Utriusque cosmi historia*, was published, Rudolph II died and was succeeded as king of Bohemia by Ferdinand of Styria. Under Rudolph, Prague had become a haven for Jewish and Christian cabalists as well as a center for the Counter Reformation. Rudolph had conferred in person with Rabbi Loew, creator of the Golem, and had actually asked him for spiritual advice. Loew was the vehicle in Prague for a more virulent form of Cabalism confected by Isaac Luria. At the same time, the Catholic Church had placed the writings of Reuchlin on the index. Since contradictory forces were allowed to grow unhindered while Rudolph closeted himself in occult studies, conflict was inevitable. Moreover, the political landscape still harbored a large Hussite contingent sympathetic with neither the Jews nor the Catholics.

The situation came to a head when Ferdinand became king. Ferdinand was a staunch Jesuit-educated Bavarian Catholic. His attempts to implement the Counter Reformation led to a Hussite revolt. During one stormy meeting with his Hussite subjects, two Catholic leaders were thrown out a window of the castle, an event known as the second defenestration of Prague. This defenestration eventually led to the Thirty Years War. Its immediate effect, however, was to drive Ferdinand from Bohemia and put that kingdom in open

rebellion against the Hapsburgs. During the rebellion, the Hussites approached Frederick and asked him to become their Protestant king. Frederick took a month to decide. On September 28, 1619, knowing it was a declaration of war against the Hapsburgs, Frederick accepted and set off for Prague to mount the Bohemian throne. The English Protestants were convinced their hopes for a revived anti-Catholic crusade were about to be fulfilled. "It seemed," Yates says, "as though the 'only Phoenix of the world,' the old Queen Elizabeth, was returning and that some great new dispensation was at hand."[42] That was one delusion Frederick's rash move inspired. Another was that James would come to his son-in-law's aid when the Hapsburgs marched on Prague to demand their kingdom back, a belief shared by the English and the Hussites. The widespread sentiment found expression in verse: "Jacobus, her lord and father dear / Through her has become / Our mightiest patron and support; / He will not deter us / Otherwise we would suffer great disasters."[43] The notion was widespread but wrong.

The folly of thinking James would risk his throne by engaging in a land war in Prague, hundreds of miles from any coast and deep in enemy territory, became apparent when the Duke of Bavaria crushed Frederick's forces at the Battle of White Mountain outside Prague on November 8, 1620. The defeat was so crushing and so sudden that Elizabeth and Frederick had to flee with little more than the clothes on their backs. Before Elizabeth and Frederick could make it home, troops loyal to the Spanish Hapsburgs invaded Heidelberg, destroyed their castle and gardens, and deposed Frederick. The Protestant Cabalist Crusade in the age of Christian Rosencreutz was a soap bubble caught between Hapsburg steel and Stuart indifference. Eventually the young couple ended up in Holland, Europe's safe house for Protestant revolutionaries, where they spent their lives in exile and crushing penury.

One of the soldiers at the battle of White Mountain was a young Frenchman by the name of René Descartes. Almost one year to the day before the battle which drove occultism underground in Europe, Descartes was quartered on the Danube in a house which had a German *Kachelofen.* This invention allowed the young philosopher to stay warm beyond the hustle and bustle of the kitchen hearth during the winter months. So, by himself in a comfortably heated room, Descartes dozed off and had one of the most famous dreams in the history of philosophy. When he awoke on November 11, 1619, he was convinced mathematics was the key to understanding nature. All that remained was for him to draw the philosophical conclusions.

Descartes kept hearing about a brotherhood of the Rose Cross that possessed wisdom hitherto unavailable to the scholastics, whose teachings he had imbibed from the Jesuits. In 1621 Descartes traveled through Moravia, Silesia, Northern Germany, and the Catholic Netherlands, searching in vain for the secret brotherhood that was now a faint echo of the failed Protestant regime at Heidelberg. In 1623 Descartes returned to Paris only to learn his

search had made him an object of suspicion. The Rosicrucian movement had incurred the ire of forces promoting the Counter Reformation in France. In 1623, an anonymous pamphlet entitled "Horrible Pacts Made Between the Devil and the Pretended Invisible Ones" appeared in Paris. Since Descartes was rumored to have joined "the Invisibles" in Germany, he was suspected of the sort of abominations described in the pamphlet:

> The adepts prostrated themselves before [the Devil] and swore to abjure Christianity and all the rites and sacraments of the Church. In return they were promised the power to transport themselves wherever they wished, to have purses always full of money, to dwell in any country, attired in the dress of that country so that they were taken for native inhabitants, to have the gift of eloquence so that they could draw all men to them, to be admired by the learned and sought out by the curious and recognized as wiser than the ancient prophets.[44]

The "Horrible Pacts" pamphlet was a garbled account of the cabalistic technology Bacon described in *The New Atlantis*. It was the first of many garbled English texts that would cause consternation in France. Eventually, the texts were deliberately garbled, as the Whigs used Huguenot refugees to foment revolution, but in this instance, the garbling was probably unintentional. The pamphlet's fears bespoke a French Catholic reading of the intentions behind the Jewish Cabalistic fantasies inspiring the Rosicrucians and their English admirers.

Descartes was rescued by his friend and former classmate at the Jesuit college of La Fleche, Fr. Martin Mersenne, who assured Church and State authorities Descartes was most certainly not and most probably never had been "invisible." Mersenne would become one of Descartes' greatest promoters on the continent; he launched that effort in *Quaestiones in Genesim*, a key work marking the transition from the Renaissance modes of magical thinking into those of the scientific era. Mersenne's *Quaestiones* was a direct attack on the tradition of occultism as practiced by Ficino, Pico, and Reuchlin—all of whom were accused of promoting Jewish magic. He later expanded his attack on Cabala by attacking Fludd, with whom he exchanged a famous series of letters.

By the time the dust settled, Jewish occult science was history on the continent. Numerology and Gematria were replaced by mathematics, and Descartes was enthroned as the philosopher who would determine the course of history on the continent for the next three centuries. The Aristotelian *quidditas* had been routed by Reuchlin and the Reformation, which acted as a vehicle for Jewish Cabalism. When Mersenne destroyed that tradition, he paved the way for the triumph of Descartes, whose philosophy would sketch out all possible philosophical options. Descartes' radical disjunction of the world into *res extensa* and *res cogitans* led to both materialism and idealism.

Descartes' explication of the *res extensa* led inexorably to the materialism of Spinoza, and the revolutionary ideology of his followers, Toland and Collins, which led to the Enlightenment, the French Revolution, and Karl Marx. But his explication of the *res cogitans* led just as inexorably to the idealism of Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel and other apostles of the reaction to Revolution that became Romanticism in Germany.

In the aftermath of Mersenne's demolition of Fludd, Descartes' philosophy reigned supreme on the continent, but he soon had a challenger in England. Bacon would save the Protestant cause from an intellectual rout analogous to the military rout on the continent until Newton's *Principia* arrived in 1687, but Bacon's science could never get beyond its Jewish roots, and so England couldn't either. Protestants were judaizers, so to remain faithful to the Protestant cause England had to espouse judaizing in one of either two forms during the 17th century: Puritanism or freemasonry. England's colonies in America when faced with the same choice would resolve the dilemma differently.

Baconian science never stopped being Jewish science, no matter how much Whig historians later tried to sanitize it. As Yates pointed out, "the old view of Bacon as a modern scientific observer and experimentalist emerging out of a superstitious past is no longer valid."[45] Bacon's science grew out of Magia and Cabala and the desire to restore the *prisca theologia*, which was bound up with the Hebrew language, as Reuchlin had pointed out 100 years earlier. Similarly, Bacon's "'great instauration' of science" as proposed in *Novum Organum* "was directed towards a return to Adam's state before the Fall, a state of pure and sinless contact with nature and knowledge of her powers. This was the view of scientific progress backwards towards Adam, held by Cornelius Agrippa, the author of the influential Renaissance textbook on occult philosophy. And Bacon's science is still, in part, occult science."[46] No matter how embarrassing Bacon's Jewish science became for the Newtonians, they shared the same goal: defeat of the Catholic powers on the continent. English science was always intimately connected with English foreign policy.

HIS MAJESTY CHARLES II'S RESTORATION TO THE THRONE OF ENGLAND

In April 1650, about the time Menasseh ben Israel dedicated *The Hope of Israel* to the English Parliament in the hope that it would readmit the Jews to England, Charles II, Cromwell's rival and the son of the man he murdered, met with a group of influential Jews in Holland and tried to borrow 50,000 pounds to finance an invasion of England. During the 1650s, the Royalist supporters of Charles II were conspiring with the Jews while Menasseh was negotiating with Cromwell. Menasseh, the credulous rabbi from Amsterdam who thought American Indians were the ten lost tribes of Israel, was an agent,

but he was also a pawn in a larger game. The Jews were avid to be associated with the world's premier maritime power when colonies were starting to pay lucrative returns, so avid that they hedged their bets, backing both Cromwell and Charles II.

Although the Puritans were judaizers, some observers felt the Jews had a closer affinity to the Scots. In *The Wonderfull and Most Deplorable History of the Latter Times of the Jews*, James Howell claimed Jews and Scots shared the same DNA. Edward I, the first Christian prince to expel the Jews from his territories, also disliked the Scots. Many of the Jews expelled from England went to Scotland, "where they have propagated since in great number."[47] As further proof of the blood ties between the Scots and the Jews, Howell noted "the aversion" the Scottish nation "hath above all others to hogs-flesh."[48] The Scots also "much glory in their [i.e., the Jews'] mysterious Cabal, wherein they make the reality of things to depend upon letters and words; but they hold that the Hebrew hath sole privilege of this. This Cabal. . . is, as they say, a reparation in some measure for the loss of our knowledge of Adam, and they say it was revealed four times."[49]

Howell is referring to freemasonry, which was then strong in Scotland. The Lodge, Stephenson says, was introduced into England when the court of James I arrived in London. The origins of the lodge are surrounded in mystery. Masons on the continent invariably traced their history back to the destruction of the Knights Templar in 1326. Whether the Templars fled to Scotland, as Howell claims the Jews did, is speculation. What is fairly certain, however, is that the lodges in Scotland were operative before they were "speculative," i.e., they were originally organizations of masons, architects, and engineers who actually built buildings and military fortifications and used mathematical traditions handed down by those familiar with their practical application. Gradually, their penchant for construction took a mystical or metaphysical bent, and freemasonry became involved in an attempt to recover something great which had been lost. Freemasonry would achieve this through the recovery of the name of Jehovah and the reconstruction of Solomon's Temple.

Sir Robert Moray, Charles II's agent, was an important link between Jews and Freemasons. Moray was also a founding member of the Royal Society. He was also a crucial link in the evolution of freemasonry from an operative Scottish operation into a speculative Whig operation. Moray was active among the Scottish exiles eager to see the Stuart line restored to the English throne. His letters to them indicate freemasonry was the means whereby they were going to achieve their end both practically and theoretically. These two facets of freemasonry were intimately linked for Moray. When Alexander Bruce fled from Scotland to Swedish-controlled Bremen in 1657, Moray encouraged him to immerse himself in studies of Jewish lore, Hermetic chemistry, Paracelsan medicine, Egyptian hieroglyphics, and masonic symbolism as a consolation for what he had lost and the first step in regaining it. The Cabala provided

Moray with "the very Alphabets of things I knew," and he was conversant in Jewish lore even if he could not yet "be saluted as Rabbi."[50] Moray profited from reading Reuchlin's *De Verbo Mirifico* as well as the writings of Drusius, from which he learned about building Solomon's Temple. From Drusius's discussion of the Temple, Moray learned "in which sense Salomon and Hiram were brothers."[51] Moray was adamant, however, in insisting on the operative nature of the lodge, telling Bruce "Before you come in cheek by jowl with me at building Castles in the air, you must first be prentice as I was, then Mr. Mason as I am, and produce a masterpiece as I did."[52] Moray felt the lodge was mystical because it was first "practical," i.e., based on what masons had learned by building actual buildings. The mystical side of the craft was based on numerological theories derived from the "Zohar, Pico, Reuchlin and Montano on the magical Tetragrammaton, the androgynous Adam Kadmon, the male and female dynamics of the Hebrew letters and numbers, and the cosmic significance of the Temple architecture."[53] Unlike the "invisible" Rosicrucian brotherhood, which Descartes sought but never found, this essentially Jewish mystical building fraternity was an actual organization.[54]

Like the Jews, the Scots were in exile. The solution, taken from the Zohar, was to rebuild the Temple. Moray felt the pious man should pray "for the reunion of the scattered," for "the reappearance of justice and restoration of the former condition," and for "the return to Jerusalem, which again is to form the seat of the Divine Influence."[55] The Zohar gave explicit instructions on how post-exilic Jews, deprived of a proper place of worship when the Temple had been destroyed, could fulfill their "obligation to build a sanctuary below on the pattern of the Temple above. . . and to pray within it every day in order to serve the Holy One." For, the Zohar continues,

> the synagogue below matches the synagogue above. . . . The Temple that King Solomon built was a house of repose on the celestial pattern, with all its adornments so that there might be in the restored world above a house of repose and rest. . . . A house is essential. . . to enable the upper abode to descend to the lower abode, and [in the open air] there is none. Moreover, both prayer and spirit have to ascend directly to Jerusalem from a narrow confined place.[56]

Scots like Moray took the instructions from the Zohar they had received via Christian writers like Reuchlin and incorporated them into the myths and rituals of freemasonry, where they were seen as an alternative to and antidote against sectarian strife. The lodge was more than just a society for studying Cabala and numerology; it was a secret political organization with a specific political purpose, namely, restoration of the Stuarts to the throne of England. As such, it incurred the suspicions of the Puritans. Cromwell's spies reported on William Davidson in 1654. Davidson was an Episcopalian merchant with many Jewish partners in trading ventures on the West Indian

island of Barbados. Barbados remained stubbornly royalist throughout the interregnum, so Cromwell attempted to punish them economically and militarily. When Parliament passed the Navigation Acts to punish the Dutch for poaching on English territories, Davidson and his Jewish backers suffered financially from the loss of trade. Provoked by their continued resistance (a resistance Cromwell unwittingly fostered by banishing many Scots and Irish royalists to the island), Cromwell sent the navy to Barbados and impressed over 4000 men into the ships of the Republic. During this mission, the English navy seized several Dutch ships, including the *Mary of London* "owned by Sir William Davidson and taken at Barbados with five other Dutch ships."[57]

Davidson had other reasons to be upset. The English Puritans were threatening to expand their economic embargo of Holland into a full-fledged military campaign. To fulfill his role as the English Gideon, Cromwell would eventually have to meet the Catholic Amalekites in battle, and he could only do that on the Continent, since they had already been extirpated from England. In 1657 George Fox, the leader of the Quakers, rebuked Cromwell for not attacking Rome, which probably means that by 1657 the planned invasion had been called off. But it also suggests William Davidson and his network of Jewish merchants and intelligencers were rightly concerned during late 1654 and early 1655 that an invasion of Holland was afoot.

The founding of the Masonic Lodge in Newport, Rhode Island, in 1658 was a sign of this concern and evidence of growing disenchantment with Puritan and Quaker attempts to convert the Jews. The Jews had relocated to Rhode Island because of its reputation for religious tolerance at a time when Cromwell was making their lives economically difficult in Barbados, religiously difficult in England by proposing conversion instead of tolerance, and physically difficult in Holland by considering a military invasion of their only safe outpost. The first Jews in America were also masons. The evidence for Jewish-masonic contact in Holland in the 1650s thus provides a credible historical context for an otherwise puzzling document that recorded a meeting of masons in Newport in 1658: "wee mett at y House of Mordecai Campunall and affter Synagog Wee gave Abm Moses the degrees of Maconrie."[58] According to Katz, "Masonic historians have instead chosen to ignore the possibility, no doubt reluctant to claim Jews as the first known masons in America. Such early connections between Jews and masons would hardly be surprising, given the strong cabalistic, magical, and Hermetical associations of the movement in the 17th century, and the many later Jews who became Freemasons."[59] Jewish historians share this reluctance; they "shy away from accepting this masonic document, no doubt because of an unwillingness to confirm that the first Jews in English America were Freemasons."[60] Katz believes the Jewish Freemasons of Newport probably came from Barbados, where they had been tolerated along with the Quakers. However, the Scottish connection of certain

Jews in Barbados, as well as Amsterdam, suggests another explanation for the masonic ceremony in 1658.

The time was ripe for Jewish-Royalist collaboration, and Charles II exploited the opportunity. In 1652 Charles ordered John Middleton, his lieutenant-general in Scotland, to travel to the Hague to obtain supplies for a Scottish rebellion. In the Hague, Middleton contacted Davidson and his network of Jewish agents and intelligencers, whose economic interests had been adversely affected by Cromwell's Navigation Acts. As a result of the contact, the Jews expressed a willingness to contribute financially to Middleton and Davidson's plan for an uprising in Scotland.

In 1654 Menasseh ben Israel had been languishing in Holland since publication of *The Hope of Israel.* The war between England and Holland prevented him from traveling to England when messianic fervor was burning red-hot. When he arrived, the ardor had cooled as the Puritans reflected more soberly upon the fact that the Ashkenazim might have different habits than the people the Puritans read about in the Old Testament. At the still point which indicates the turning of the tide, Menasseh had become interested in Queen Christina of Sweden, a philo-Semitic bibliophile who had purchased a number of Hebrew books from him. Menasseh hoped to parlay his role as the agent purchasing books for her library into becoming her mentor, so he could persuade her to let the Jews emigrate to Sweden.

His plans were dashed when she abdicated in June of 1654. Disillusioned with sectarian fragmentation besetting the Protestant cause, Christina went off to search for a "higher" version of Christianity that would eschew religious strife and incorporate the *prisca theologia* Reuchlin had descried in the Hebrew scriptures. Christina, who eventually founded a secret Academy for esoteric studies, was drawn to a "higher" Christianity strikingly similar to freemasonry. Christina's public conversion to Catholicism understandably provoked a barrage of criticism. When asked if she were Lutheran or Catholic, she replied, "I myself believed in a third religion, which, having found the truth, has cast aside the beliefs of these established churches, because it has rejected these beliefs as untrue."[61]

The Jews were only too happy to oblige her in her quest. In July Christina arrived in Hamburg with her entourage, including a number of well-connected Jews, among them her physician Dr. Benedict De Castro and Abraham Texeira, the wealthy banker, at whose house she stayed. The Puritans were scandalized. The feelings were mutual. Angered that Carl X, her successor, had allied himself with Cromwell after her abdication, thereby associating her with a regicide, Christina denounced the Protector publicly. The Puritans responded in kind. One propagandist (known only by the initials I.H.) published *A Relation in the Life of Christina,* accusing her not only of taking up residence in Hamburg with a Jew, "a man, who is by profession, a sworn

enemy of Jesus Christ,"[62] but also of having sexual relations with him and of being waited on by demons which she and the Jew conjured.

Christina moved to Antwerp in August, where she lodged with another wealthy Jew, a friend of Texiera. Hoping to get reimbursed for his services as a book dealer, Menasseh traveled to Antwerp to meet with Christina. When the meeting came to nothing, Menasseh turned back to England. Aware Menasseh was again working for Cromwell, Christina arranged a meeting with Charles Stuart in October and assured him of her support. More importantly, she assured him of the support of the network of Jewish bankers and merchants she had assembled since her abdication. Delighted by the prospect of significant financial support, Charles knighted William Davidson, his contact with the Jews, for his role in bringing all of this together.

Charles also enlisted the support of Sir Marmaduke Langdale, another Catholic convert with mystical inclinations who had converted after seeing a vision in a magician's glass in Italy. Langdale was "very sorry" the Jews agreed with Cromwell and did his best to convince them to change sides. "The Jews," Langdale informed Charles,

> are considerable all the world over, and be great masters of money. If his Ma'ty could have them or divert them from Cromwell, it were a very good service. I heard of this three yeares agone, but hoped the Jewes, that understand the interest of all the princes in the world, had bene too wise to adventure themselves and estates under Cromwell, where they may by his death or the other alteracion in that kingdome runn the hazared of an absolute ruine but they hate monarchy and are angry for the patent that was granted by King James to my Lord of Suffolke for the discovery of them, which made most of the ablest of them to fly out of England.[63]

Charles sent Langdale to Brussels to meet with the Jews. These meetings probably deepened Puritan suspicion of the Jews. Before long the Puritans were convinced a Catholic-Jewish conspiracy was afoot. They were, of course, correct. In September 1655, the Duke of Ormonde visited "the Jewes sinagogue" in Frankfurt, to get more financial support for Charles' planned invasion of England.[64]

One month later, in October 1655, Menasseh finally arrived in London. It was an inauspicious moment for a number of reasons. Messianic fervor had cooled considerably since 1650. Moreover, because of Christina's public attack on Cromwell and her public association with Jews, including Menasseh, the Puritans viewed Jews with increased suspicion. The Puritans who had been so effusive in emulation of Jewish mores as garnered from their reading of the Old Testament now felt the Jews could not be trusted. Even John Dury, who had been instrumental in interesting Menasseh in coming to England, was having second thoughts. Dury felt England should "go warily and by degrees," because the Jews "have ways beyond all other men, to undermine

a state, and to insinuate into those that are in offices, and prejudiciate the trade of others."[65] The Puritans must have known Jewish money supported the Glencairn rising, which General Monk had just put down in Scotland, since Davidson and Moray were involved and they were Charles' contacts with the Jews. The Puritan suspicion of the Jews came out in the open when Prynne, who had justified the regicide, published his *Short Demurrer to the Jews* shortly after Menasseh's arrival in England.

This change in public opinion had its effect on Cromwell. The readmission of the Jews had become politically impossible. In response to the public outcry, Cromwell put conditions on re-entry that the Jews found unacceptable. A report circulated that "Cromwell says it is an ungodly thing to admit the Jews."[66] Cromwell also wanted more money from the Jews than they were willing to pay. The Jews wanted assurances from Parliament, "for their being there with safety," which Parliament was no longer willing to give.[67]

As a result, by February the deal had fallen through. As soon as the Jews learned of Menasseh's failure to reach an agreement with Cromwell, they arranged a meeting with the exiled Charles II in Bruges, where they assured him they had never approved of Menasseh's mission to Cromwell. Menasseh was the sacrificial lamb that sealed the covenant between the Jews and the Stuarts. As a *quid pro quo*, the Jews would abandon their support of Menasseh and the now discredited Puritans. The masonic conspiracy, as their part of the deal, distanced themselves from the policies of the Enthusiasts, in particular their desire to convert the Jews. The assurances were most certainly oral, but they appeared in print too. In his *Themis Aurea. the Laws of the Fraternity of the Rosie Cross,* Michael Maier stated unequivocally "That the Brethren of the Rosy Cross does neither dream of, hope for, or endeavour any Reformation in the world by Religion, the conversion of the Jews, or the policies of Enthusiasts . . . . They who bend their thoughts to change Commonwealths, to alter Religion, to innovate the Arts, make use very often of most despicable instruments to do their business."[68]

So, during the summer of 1656, "some principal persons of the Hebrew nation residing in Amsterdam"[69] abandoned Menasseh and approached John Middleton indicating they were ready to put their financial resources at the disposal of Charles Stuart to restore him to the throne of England. Charles was delighted. On September 24, 1556, while still in Brugge, Charles II told Middleton to "Assure the Jews of our gratious disposition." When he met with the Jews in Amsterdam, Middleton was also to

> behave yourself in this commission wee have given you to the Jewes in such manner as upon their behavior to you shall judge fitt, and if you find the same good disposition in them towards our service which they expressed to you heretofore, by assuring them of our gratious disposition and how willing we shall be (when God shall restore us) to extend our

protection to them, and to abate the rigour of the Lawes against them in our severall dominions, and. . . they shall lay a signal obligacion upon us, it will not only dispose us to be gratious to them, and to be willinge to protecte them, but be a morall assurance to them that wee shall be able to do whatsoever wee shall be willinge when we can justly publishe and declare to all men how much we have bene beholdinge to them and how farr they have contributed to our restoration.[70]

In a second letter the same day, Charles continued:

whereas you have represented to us the good affection which some principal person of the Hebrew Nacion residing in Amsterdam have expressd towards our service, and that they have assured you that the application which has been lately made to Crumwell on their behalfe by some members of that nacion hath been without ther consent, and is utterly disavowed by them, and they are desirous of all offices to express their good will to us and desyre our reestablishement.[71]

Charles then moved to the brass tacks of the deal. In exchange for "contributions of mony, Armes or Ammuncion,"[72] Charles would readmit the Jews to England, and thereafter he would exert no pressure on them to convert. This was especially attractive to the Jews because Quaker proselytizing in Amsterdam was causing increasing resentment in the synagogue.

Freemasonry made this new alliance possible. It proposed a new *modus vivendi* that avoided the pitfalls associated with the discredited enthusiasm of the Puritans and Quakers. As part of the royalist masonic cabal in the Netherlands, Constantijn Huygens had contacts with Moray and Davidson as well as Jews like Rabbi Jacob Jehuda Leon, who took his model of the Temple to London in 1675. Rabbi Leon also designed a coat of arms for the English Grand Lodge that is "entirely full of Jewish symbols."[73] The motto for the lodge is "Holiness to the Lord," but upon closer inspection the motto is trodden upon by figures with the hooves and haunches of goats. Rabbi Leon was consulted on various architectural projects, and his model of the Temple figured in the design of the new Amsterdam synagogue. Shuchard thinks Leon may have been a mason because "when a Jew was particularly proficient in his profession," the Amsterdam guilds "were forced to admit him."[74] Davidson became friends with another rabbi, Jacob Abendana, at around the same time. Freemasonry provided a forum for the exchange of ideas of intense interest to the Christians. It also provided protection for the Jews. Both were bound by vows of secrecy and loyalty; both were united by a desire to learn the secret knowledge of Cabala and by a desire to find practical application for that knowledge, be it in buildings or governments.

They soon had their chance. Cromwell died in September 1658. When the incompetence of Cromwell's son Richard soon became apparent, the royalists increased their activity in Scotland, where a resistance movement had been

active since January 1654. One of Cromwell's lieutenants, General Monk, had been appointed military governor of Scotland. Unlike Cromwell, Monk not only did not dislike the Scots under his rule, he fraternized with them in a way that the Protector would have found unseemly. That fraternizing led to its logical conclusion when Monk, perhaps initiated by Tessin, the Swedish architect in charge of his fortifications at Leith, became a Freemason. Because Monk had an intelligence network informing him of the mood of the locals, he must have been aware of the massive shift in sentiment after Cromwell's death. Scottish preachers referred to the Scots as Israelites who would been soon be led from bondage to Pharaoh out of Egypt, and before long Monk found himself wondering if he was the Moses that was supposed to lead them. When Monk joined the lodge, he gained access to its intelligence network as well, and what he learned convinced him that the time was ripe to switch sides.

In November 1659, the Army of Scotland, with Monk at its head, marched south to free England from "the Tyranny and Usurpation of the Army."[75] In January 1660 Monk joined forces with Sir Thomas Fairfax and the Duke of Buckingham, "an old mason,"[76] at York, where they pledged the support of the northern counties. On May 1, Charles issued the Declaration of Breda, which made universalist freemasonry the basis for religious toleration in England under the restored monarchy. When Charles landed at Dover later that month, Monk was there to greet him. To show that there were no hard feelings over the role which Monk had played in the murder of Charles' father, the restored Stuart king took the reins of governance from Monk's hands and made him Duke of Albermarle for his troubles. He also made Monk one of his closest advisors.

During one of his first consultations with the new king, Monk in collaboration with Augustin Coronel, a Portuguese Jew who had settled in England in the early 1650s "as a merchant and royalist agent. . .receiving and distributing funds for the exiled King,"[77] proposed that Charles II should marry the Portuguese Infanta, Catherine of Braganza. Coronel came up with the idea in April, one month before Charles returned to England. Coronel had also played a major role in bringing the Jews around to abandoning Menasseh and Cromwell and supporting Charles instead. He was in close contact with David da Costa and Bento de la Coste, and may have known Solomon Franco, who would become Ashmole's Hebrew teacher, linking him to the Royal Society as well. Eventually Coronel would become a Christian after being knighted by the king, but all of the crucial services he performed leading to the restoration had been performed as a Jew in collaboration with other Jews.

The eclipse of Puritanism caused the Puritan bard John Milton to fear he would be tried for treason and regicide before finishing his masterpiece *Paradise Lost*, but it did not diminish the use of Hebrew imagery in English

poetry. Cowley used it in his "Ode upon His Majesties Restoration and Return," in which he "portrayed the King, his brother James and Monk as Jewish heroes":

Me-thought I saw the three Judaen Youths
(Three unhurt Martryes for the Noblest Truths)
In the Chaldaen Furnace walk
'Tis the good General [Monk], the man of Praise
Whom God at last in gracious pitty
did to the' enthrall'ed nation raise
Their great Zarubbabel to be,
To loose the Bonds of long Captivity,
And to rebuild their Temple and their city.[78]

Charles was true to his word. When London merchants asked Charles to expel the Jews who had settled in London *sub rosa* during the Protectorate, Charles instead favored the Jewish merchants. Resentment of the Jews was not going away, no matter how much the king favored the people whose money had brought him to the throne. On December 16, the goldsmith Thomas Violet issued a Petition against the Jews, taking issue with the religion "Mr. Moses, their High Priest and other Jewes" practiced openly in London "to the great dishounour of Christianity and public scandal of the true Protestant Religion."[79]

In a nation burnt out from the excesses of Enthusiasm, this public zeal for Christianity fell on deaf ears. Sensing this, the Jews pressed for "endenization" and found widespread acceptance among the tolerant masons running Charles' council. Many of his advisors needed no encouragement. Davidson pressed the king for the rapid endenization of his business partners as a reward for their support of the Restoration. The king obliged, hoping wealth from their gold-mining and trading ventures would pour into the royal coffers. In his history of the Jews in England, Cecil Roth says Jewish influence increased under Charles, who was "liberal in issuing patents of endenization" and who raised "the little Jue" Coronel to knighthood in gratitude for his marriage, which brought him the colony of Tangier and a significant increase in wealth.[80] The Jewish agent La Costa brought the dowry to England, and in gratitude Charles bestowed upon La Costa's associate Isaac Israel de Piso, a gold chain as a "Mark of our Royall Favour."[81] Collaboration this intimate could not have occurred under Catholic or even Protestant auspices, as Cromwell's failure to admit the Jews made clear. Freemasonry made it possible because Jews and Freemasons shared a common goal; they both wanted to restore a great thing which had been lost. Like Davidson, Moray, and the Scottish masons who returned from exile, Rabbi (Jacob) Abandana and the Jewish royalists would seek a revival of the ancient sciences of Solomon, by which "the holy Temple" could be rebuilt within the adept and restored to its place in the center of

the cosmos.[81a] Jew and Christian could unite in the worship of the same god, "the Grand Architect of the Universe," whose anointed king was now on the throne.

THE ROYAL SOCIETY

Yates says, "It is obvious that the Puritan worship of Jehova would be conducive to Cabalistic studies,"[82] but the Interregnum Years were not good for freemasonry. Once the news of the Puritan revolution spread to the continent, the Protestant remnant of the Rosicrucian era pricked up its ears and thought of migrating to England. In 1640 Samuel Hartlib published his version of *The New Atlantis*, a utopia entitled *A Description of the Famous Kingdom of Macaria*. Comenius heard the call and migrated to England, where he felt it was now possible to build the New Atlantis the Rosicrucians had longed for since the Counter Reformation dashed their hopes on the Continent. John Dury published a similarly optimistic work. And John Milton published his work on universal reform in education in 1641.

The sense a new era was about to dawn soon died amid the realities of civil war. The Invisible College proposed in *The New Atlantis* and other Rosicrucian writings did not become a real college during the Interregnum. If anything, it became even more invisible so as to stay out of trouble. Christopher Wren, who was to become England's greatest architect at the time of the Restoration, told Evelyn "there were no masons in London when he was a young man."[83]

Once the Puritans were driven from power, the king, brought back by a conspiracy of Jews and Freemasons, would be favorably disposed to the other version of Cabala, known as "science." The reason is simple. Both movements derived from John Dee's Christian Cabalism. The exoteric part of that movement became the Royal Society; the esoteric part became freemasonry, which popularized the cabalistic elements of Dee's thought when Newton mathematicized science. The large overlap between the early members of the Royal Society and the Lodge indicates the compatibility, if not the identity, of the two groups. Elias Ashmole, the promoter of John Dee, was admitted to the Lodge in 1646; Robert Moray, Charles II's agent with the Jews, became a member in 1641; both would later become members of the Royal Society. Gradually, the Rosicrucians who gathered around Robert Boyle, Robert Hooke, John Wilkins, and Christopher Wren formed the "Invisible College" at Oxford that would be the predecessor to the Royal Society. In 1658 John Heydon published *A New Method of Rosie-Crucian Physick,* in which he stressed the Jewish origins of Rosicrucianism. Two years later, just after Charles's restoration, Heydon had dinner with the king and the Duke of Buckingham to explain how Moses was "father and founder" of the fraternity of the Rosey Cross "of the order of Elias or Ezekiel." Rosicrucians were initiated "into the Mosaicall Theory," then graduated to the "Natural Magic of Solomon."[84] To bring this ancient science to perfection as proposed by Bacon in *The New*

Moray, Bruce, Evelyn, Ashmole and other masons founded the Royal Society.

Forty years after Mersenne demolished Fludd, Dee's tradition was still going strong in England, even though, after the publication of Meric Casaubon's attack on Dee, it was no longer politically astute to mention his name. Even after the founding of the Royal Society, English science was still Jewish science; it was still cabalistic, symbolical, and numerological. It had not changed since Reuchlin. Rev. John Wilkins, his disciple, wrote that "important scientific and technological information was encoded in the Jewish scriptures."[85] Science was still bound up with the *prisca theologia*; it involved recovering the lost wisdom of Adam and using that knowledge to reconstruct the Temple of Solomon. "If you believe the Jews," Wilkins wrote, "the Holy Spirit hath purposely involved in the Words of Scripture, every Secret that belongs to any Art or Science, under such Cabalisms as these. And if a Man were expert in unfolding of them, it were easie for him to get as much Knowledge as Adam had in his Innocency, or Human Nature is capable of."[86]

Rosicrucian "science" existed on three levels for members of the Royal Society, just as it had for John Dee: mathematics and mechanics for the lower world, celestial mechanics for the higher world, and angelic conjuration for the realm above the celestial spheres. Technological innovations were linked to the construction of Solomon's Temple, and drew on sources as diverse as Vitruvian architecture, Dee's reading of Euclid, Fludd's mechanical tracts, and Kircher's works on magnetism.

At the time of its founding in 1662, the Royal Society was a continuation of Dee's anti-Catholic crusade on behalf of Elizabethan British Imperialism. "Science" never lost sight of its political beginnings, but it had to consider what had happened in England in the intervening years. The science that Robert Boyle and his colleagues articulated in the Royal Society was intended as an antidote to the religious enthusiasm of the 1640's and '50's. The Jehovah that ordered Cromwell into battle was replaced by a Deity whose main characteristics could be seen in the order and harmony of the universe he had created, and then left to run according to its own rules. Human society should imitate the order in nature if men wanted to live orderly and harmonious lives. Men who felt they could ignore nature and discern the mind of God directly through private revelations threatened this order. These men—the Puritans, Quakers, Ranters, Diggers, and Fifth Monarchy Men—had implemented the Protestant vision—a conflation of Muentzer and Luther that was a combination of *sola scriptura* and mystical visions—and had failed. England was tired of prophets with visions. But it also feared atheism. Boyle's antidote to those visions was threatened from the other direction by writers like Hobbes, who wrote *Leviathan* in 1651 out of his experience of chaos in the English Civil War. Hobbes and his followers felt that motion was inherent in matter, and thus there was no need of divine providence in a universe which

ran all on its own accord. This vision of the universe would find its fulfillment in Marx, but it had devotees before the end of the 17th century, as we shall see.

The Royal Society was drawn toward a universe that was orderly and harmonious without fussy overseers, either in the spiritual or political realms. The stars that, according to Aristotle, moved through the heavens because angels pushed them, were replaced by bodies that continued in motion until acted on by something that would slow them down. Newton called that force gravity, which meant seriousness, a characteristic he thought inherent to God but not intrinsic to matter. It was a perfect description of the new capitalist society and its latitudinarian Episcopal underpinnings that those tired of enthusiasm and yet fearful of materialism hoped to create with Charles on the throne.

The change in English intellectual life was profound and as vehement as the rejection of enthusiasm that took place, as Christopher Dawson put it, when "men like Nicholas Barbon, the son of Praisegod Barebones," and other "children of the saints" became "promoters and financiers." God, "who would personally whisper in the ear of Praisegod Barebones, had become the architect of the universe for his son."[87]

Boyle's philosophy allowed economic activity without a meddling sovereign or atheistic chaos of the sort Hobbes feared. Bishop Edward Stillingfleet, whose worldview was the antithesis of Milton's, felt attracted to the new world. In contrast to Puritan zealots who felt God would not bless England as long as some papist was still celebrating popish rites somewhere, Stillingfleet instilled a tone of mockery into religious discourse from which the English character would never recover. Men of property who could look after their own affairs without appealing to an absolute sovereign replaced zealots like Milton. God became a constitutional monarch in England years before the king did.

If the Royal Society under Boyle was drawn to that vision when it was founded in 1662, the vision of Solomon's Temple sat inaccessible across a great chasm that could not be crossed according to the methods the society had inherited from Dee. Indeed, for its first 20 years, it looked as if this child would perish in is cradle, the victim of rude attacks from those who felt that its Jewish science was incompatible with a Christian society.

In December 1662 Samuel Butler denounced the Royal Society as practitioners of Jewish Science. Butler was a royalist who, taking up the accusation James Howell had leveled earlier, claimed judaizing had taken root in Scotland.

> For Hebrew roots, although they're found
> To flourish most in barren ground
> He had such plenty as sufficed
> To make some think him circumcised.

Hudibras, the hero of the poem, combines the worst aspects of judaic culture in Butler's eyes. He is guilty of Puritan enthusiasm.

> Such as build their faith upon
> The holy text of pike and gun
> Decide all controversies by
> Infallible artillery
> And prove their doctrine orthodox
> By apostolic blows and knocks;[88]

In referring to "Infallible artillery," Butler probably meant Cromwell, but in his dislike for things Jewish, Butler conflates two forms of judaizing that were at odds with each other—Puritan enthusiasm and masonic Cabala. The revolutionary movement in England had split in two, and those two factions waged war on each other. Just as Ziska would turn on the Taborites, just as Muentzer would turn on Luther, just as Robespierre would turn on Danton and Philippe Égalité, and just as Stalin would turn on Trotsky, so the Cabalists turned on the Enthusiasists, even though they were part of the same movement. But Butler correctly saw the Jewish subtext shared by Puritans and masons in the Royal Society. The revolutionary spirit had jumped from one judaizing movement to another, but the commitment to revolution as a prelude to heaven on earth remained constant. The end was the same, even if the means changed. In part II of *Hudibras*, which appeared in 1663, Butler has Hudibras justify the oath-breaking and sedition of the Presbyterians, whom he refers to as a "synod of rabbins," by appealing to "Jewish precedent":

> The rabbins write, when any Jew
> Did make to God or man a vow
> Which afterward he found untoward
> And stubborn to be kept, or too hard,
> And three other Jews o' th' nation
> Might free him from the obligation:
> And have not two saints power to use
> A greater privilege than the Jews?[89]

Like Butler, Samuel Parker conflated Puritans with masons. "There is," he wrote, "so much affinity between Rosi-Crucianism and Enthusiasme, that whosoever entertains the one, he may upon the same Reason embrace the other."[90] What these two opposing groups had in common was their connection to the Jews and the revolutionary spirit. Parker linked Rosicrucians and Jews as brothers in sedition. He also attacked the Cabalistic tradition, whether practiced by Jews like Isaac Luria or Christians like John Dee or, in this case, Fircher:

> I know of nothing more precarious and destitute of tolerable pretenses then these Cabalistical Traditions, being only a late and silly invention of

> the Jewish Rabbins. . . and yet Kircher. . . would have everyone that does not believe in the Divine Origin of the Cabala to be convicted of Heresie as an Enemy to Divine Providence. But, for my part, I cannot understand how any Rational man can be at all concerned for so vain and frivolous an Invention of the Modern (i.e., Trifling) Rabbins. But he that could find all the Learning of the world in an Egyptian hieroglyphik may find all the Articles of his faith in a Rabbinical Fable.[91]

From the orthodox Christian perspective Jews were odious because of their "obstinate adherence to the Mosaick Law."[92] The Jews were also notorious for distorting scripture. "They who are acquainted with the Customes and Tenets of the Modern Jewes, know what petty analogies they retch from Scripture, to abet their fond and ridiculous usages, indeed their pettinesse is so odde and surprising, that were it in any other matter, they would be as delightful as impertinent."[93] Christians who took them seriously were even worse, because in incorporating perverse Jewish misreadings into their books—he mentions Reuchlin's *De Arte Cabalistica*—they not only corrupt Christian dogma, they also open the door to sedition and revolution by promoting the imitation of Jewish revolutionary thought.

The attacks did not deter the devotees of Rosicrucianism and freemasonry from their continuing appropriation of Jewish material. Heydon, who had the king's ear when he dined with him, "stressed the Jewish origins of Rosicrucian science, utilized Hebrew letters and cited the writings of Josephus on geomancy, Ibn Ezra on sun dials and spheres, and Abraham the Jew on Alchemy."[94] Freemasonry focused Cabala on a practical project, the reconstruction of the Temple. Heydon was convinced that the Holy of Holies of the new Temple could be erected "by a process of Cabalistic meditation upon the names and attributes of God."[95] Kenelm Digby agreed, "confident if men's Minds were but truly fixt upon this Temple, they would not prove such weather Cocks, to be turned about with the Wind of every false Doctrine, of some Atheistical Astrological vaine opinions: we should then be free from those disorders which threaten destruction to the Soul and disaster to the Common-wealth."[96] Heydon invoked Reuchlin, Pico, Agrippa, Valerianus, Khunrath, and Fludd in support of his belief that "The learned Hebrews say . . . certain Divine poweres, or as it wer members of God, which by the Sepheroths. . . have an influence on all things created."[97]

By 1675, the Royal Society was in crisis because it still had not disentangled itself from the legacy of Jewish science. Living in Holland, which was intellectually and geographically half-way between England and France, Constantijn Huygens was worried that his fellow masons at the Royal Society were being overtaken by the French. Alarmed by the desuetude into which "Solomon's House" had fallen in England, Huygens felt the Royal Society could be revitalized by a visit from the famous Dutch Rabbi Jehudah Leon. Leon had created a model of the Temple of Solomon that had served as the

model for the Jewish synagogue in Amsterdam. Huygens felt it might also be a model for English buildings, especially since fellow mason Christopher Wren was then reconstructing St. Paul's Cathedral. Wren sent the master mason Abraham Story to Amsterdam to study Leon's design. Rabbi Leon's secret mission to rebuild the Temple was also related to the decline of Jewish power. In a letter, Huygens explained the "Solomonic purpose" of Leon's mission to Wren. "This maketh me grant him the addresses he desireth of me, his intention being to shew in England a curious model of the Temple of Solomon."[98] The purpose was to turn the new Cathedral into a Temple of Solomon, which would occur when the building was sealed off and consecrated in a secret masonic ceremony. Huygens wrote letters of introduction for Leon, hoping to introduce him to the masonic elite in England. It also involved introduction to the "Cabal," what Schuchard terms, "the unofficial secret cabinet" of high level masons "which Charles II used as a secret instrument of government." Arlington, along with Lauderdale, Buckingham, Clifford and Ashley Cooper, "maintained friendships with various London Jews, who entertained their wives and daughters at sumptuous dinners."[99]

Since the "secret circle" were involved in "mystic rites" at Ham House, Lauderdale's London residence, Leon probably partook in their rites there and at the consecration of St. Paul's. Leon also came up with the deeply ambiguous logo of the Grand Lodge in London. Since speculative masonry was based on operative masonry, Huygens and the other promoters of Leon's trip to England probably hoped a spiritual breakthrough would follow construction of Solomon's Temple according to Rabbi Leon's design and the rituals that flowed from it. But no matter how helpful the trip was in terms of freemasonry, it did little to jolt the Royal Society out of its cabalistic lethargy. Indeed, because of the intimate connection between Cabala and the architecture of the Temple, Leon's trip probably harmed the Royal Society by lending renewed credence to Jewish science.

Ultimately, it was the publication of *Philosophia naturalis principia mathematica* by Isaac Newton in 1687 which diverted the Royal Society from its slow decline into oblivion by putting physical science on a firm mathematical basis and thereby ending the Dee tradition of Cabala and numerology. The new mathematical philosophy of nature banished spirits from the universe; it also created a "world natural" as a model for the operation of the "world political" in a similarly revolutionary fashion. Armed with the philosophical underpinning of Newtonian science, the newly ascendant Whigs and masons could spread revolutionary politics through the absolutist Catholic states, undermining the need for traditional rulers and enabling a society based on "laissez faire" in politics and economics. Gottfried Wilhelm von Leibniz was one of the first to claim Newton had smuggled occult properties into his system to justify creation of an "English" universe, according to which God reigned like a constitutional monarch. Magic was still in the system, but now it

was called "gravity." The explicitly occult imagery associated with Cabala and Cabalistic science was banished to freemasonry, which became the main vehicle for disseminating subversive English ideas in Catholic countries. Revolution was the natural consequence of these Jewish-British ideas. Revolution came to England one year after the publication of *Principia Mathematica*, but the Glorious Revolution was different from the Puritan Revolution of almost a half a century before. The Glorious Revolution was relatively bloodless; that experience coupled with the exposition of the mathematical laws of nature, led the Whigs, now the party of Revolution in England, to believe revolutionary forces could be harnessed for political ends.

THE GLORIOUS REVOLUTION

On June 10, 1688, panic spread among English Protestants when Mary, Queen of England, gave birth to a male heir to the throne. The young Prince of Wales was named James, after his father, James II, of the Stuart line, now king of England. James had ascended to the English throne in 1685, after his brother, Charles II, had died. Charles had converted to Catholicism on his deathbed. James, his brother, was a Catholic when he ascended the throne, and now it looked as if James would perpetuate the hold of the Catholic Stuart dynasty on the throne by siring an heir.

The Protestants reacted by unleashing a barrage of scurrilous propaganda against the royal couple. They could do this because a momentous change had taken place in English Protestantism during Charles II's reign. The Roundheads and the Cavaliers, adversaries during the civil war of the 1640's, had resolved their differences and coalesced into one pan-Protestant party. If any residual animosities remained, they were swept away by the prospect of England's return to the Catholic fold. And so the Whig propaganda machine, one of the most effective in the history of psychological warfare, went into high gear. Bishop Gilbert Burnet, who supported the Whig cause of pan-Protestant unity, claimed that the infant Prince of Wales was, in reality, the bastard offspring of Edward Petre, James' Jesuit spiritual advisor, and a nun. Bishop Burnet then sailed for the Hague and told the same story to James' daughters, one of whom, Mary, was married to the Dutch Protestant prince William of Orange.

Anti-popish plots were rife in England during Charles' declining years. They were even the stuff of popular drama. John Dryden, fearing England would slide into anarchy when Charles died, published "Absalom and Achitophel" in 1681 as his defense of hereditary monarchy. A year later, Charles's brother and successor James attended Thomas Otway's play *Venice Preserv'd or a Plot Discover'd*, in which a Judaized Covenanter named Spinoza plots to restore the English Judaizers to the throne. Otway, according to Schuchard, "Presented a nation on the verge of disaster."[100]

After poisoning the minds of James' daughters about the newborn Prince of Wales, Burnet and other Anglican bishops and their Whig supporters approached William of Orange and urged him to come to London and take over the government. William needed little persuading. He was already embroiled in a cold war with Louis XIV of France and needed allies. Since France under the Bourbons had succeeded Spain as the premier Catholic power on the continent, William's logical allies were Europe's besieged Protestant minorities.

Louis XIV helped unify the Protestant forces when he revoked the Edict of Nantes in 1685. His action sent thousands of French exiles into Holland, much as thousands of Jews went there after expulsion of the Jews from Spain. Once in Holland, the Huguenots thirsted for revenge, and it was only a matter of time before they joined with the English. Louis XIV may have crushed Protestantism in France, but in doing so, he assured a more virulent form of Protestantism would spring up in Holland when it made contact with the English Whigs. "Huguenot exiles. . . formed centres of militant anti-Catholic opinion and carried on an organized campaign of public propaganda and secret agitation against the government of Louis XIV and the Catholic Church." The Huguenot Diaspora, according to Dawson, "Instilled a common purpose into the scattered forces of Protestantism. Nowhere was this agitation stronger than in the Netherlands, where. . . they entered into relations with the exiled leaders of the English opposition who had taken refuge in Holland from the victory of the monarchical reaction in England."[101]

William responded to the Whig overtures by publicly denouncing his father-in-law's misdeeds, calling into question the legitimacy of the Prince of Wales. In November 1688 William landed at the head of an army provisioned by Jewish supporters, amid widespread anti-Catholic rioting and acts of iconoclasm, fomented by anti-Catholic Whig propaganda. James's supporters came to London to offer armed resistance to the Dutch usurper, but, perhaps because of the stress, James burst a blood vessel in his brain, which led to a stroke, which slurred his speech and impaired his judgment as he faced the battles of the next few crucial months.

Eventually, the king was captured by Dutch soldiers and brought to London under armed guard. In December 1688 James escaped and rallied the Jacobite troops in Ireland, where, at the Battle of the Boyne in July 1690, his troops were defeated by William of Orange. James then fled to France, where his supporters, familiar with the secret network that had restored Charles to the throne in 1660, established the Ecossais masonic lodges in anticipation of another return of the Stuarts to the throne of England. The grandchildren of the men who sailed into exile in France with James in 1690 returned to Scotland with James' grandson, "Bonnie Prince Charlie," for the unsuccessful Jacobite Rising of 1745. The social cohesion of the Catholic Scots in exile was due in no small measure to the Ecossais masonic lodges. Those

lodges would attract thousands of Irish refugees, known as "Wild Geese," who would preserve the "Celtic" masonic tradition while serving in the armies of sympathetic Catholic kings. The Ecossais lodges would also spread to America, where they played a role in the American Revolution. On the continent, they would seek to preserve their identity in the face of a much subtler enemy, the Whig subversion and takeover of the lodges in England.

After William of Orange returned victorious from the Battle of the Boyne, he was determined to take revolution to Catholic France and to make the Jews pay for it. As one of his first public acts, he revoked the patents of endenization Charles had granted to the Jews. It was an act of singular ingratitude, but if William could treat his father-in-law so poorly, why should he treat the Jews any better, even if it was their money and materiel that put him on the throne? According to Cecil Roth's history of the Jews in England, the Glorious Revolution was "inspired by Englishmen . . . executed by Dutchmen" and "financed by Jews."[102] William's biggest financial backer was Francisco Lopez Suasso, a Sephardic Jew from The Hague, who was elevated to the nobility as the Baron d'Avernas le Gras, after he "advanced the prince the enormous sum of two million crowns, free of interest, for his adventure."[103] Francisco de Cordova, acting for Isaac Pereira, "provided bread and forage for the troops,"[104] and Dutch synagogues prayed for the success of the English cause. Similarly, the Jewish firm of Marchado and Periera financed William's campaign in Ireland, where a number of Jews settled after William's victory. As the Protestants subdued Catholic Ireland, the Jews offered prayers of retribution in their synagogues for "our brethren, who are imprisoned in the dungeons of the Inquisition."[105] According to Roth, the English continued to use Portuguese Sephardic Jews in their campaign against Rome and the Holy Office.

It is tempting to say the Jews deserved Williams's ingratitude because they had turned on the house of the man who had so generously allowed them into England without undue financial burden, but we are talking about two different groups of Jews. The Dutch Jews, who had supplied the military materiel for William's invasion of England, followed him to Ireland, where they hoped to prosper as tax farmers. They profited from William's conquest, but the London Jews were forced to pay for his victory. The London Jews were shocked by William's lack of gratitude, causing Cecil Roth to exclaim, "this is the first case of clear discrimination against the Jews simply for being Jews in a situation that applied without distinction to all subjects of the realm. . . . William . . . was in many ways a medieval tyrant of a ruler."[106]

In 1689 a Jacobite warned that William planned to "overthrow liberty of conscience in England." As a result, "all conscientious Dissenters will, with the Jews, be again forced to take their retreat," across the English Channel to Holland.[107] The Jews waited nervously to see what the new king had in mind. The English Jews were bitterly disappointed. They were conspicuously left out

of the Toleration Act of 1689, which specifically excluded from its benefits "any person that shall deny in his preaching or writing the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity."[108] To remain in England and do business there, the Jews once again had to pay large indemnities. William had deliberately excluded the Jews from the royal protection of liberty of conscience they had enjoyed under the Catholic James II, probably because he wanted to use them as a source of funds for further wars. The Jews were outraged and threatened to "remove their effects into Holland" rather than pay "the imposition which Parliament has designed to lay upon them." Sixty years later the anger of the Jews at William's war tax was still fresh in the minds of Englishmen and cited by Henry Fielding, novelist and Whig propagandist, who felt Scots were natural philo-Semites and English Jews "Jacobite Rabbins."[109]

Christopher Dawson referred to the Glorious Revolution as "the greatest victory that Protestantism had won since the independence of the Netherlands themselves."[110] The Glorious Revolution gave a new life to a Protestant Revolution, which otherwise tended toward peaceful coexistence, like the *modus vivendi* the Lutherans worked out with the Catholics in Germany. The Glorious Revolution not only "united Puritans and Episcopalians in defense of their common Protestantism," by choosing William of Orange, "the foremost representative of continental Protestantism," as its leader, "it inaugurated the long struggle against Louis XIV which broke the strength of the French monarch" and eventually brought down the House of Bourbon in France.[111]

The vehicle for the Whig assault on Catholic France was freemasonry, after it had been purged of its Scottish and Jacobite associations. The lodge became the vehicle for Newtonian ideas too, proposing as an alternative to the Catholic Christ of the Counter Reformation, the Grand Architect of the Universe, "who had constructed the cosmic machine and left it to follow its own laws"[112] in the same way the new constitutional monarch had handed over the English economy to Whig merchants and landlords. Newton provided the metaphysical foundation for Whig foreign policy:

> In the aftermath of the Revolution of 1688-9, liberal Christianity wedded to the new science was offered to an English and eventually to a European audience as a binding social philosophy capable of reconciling diverse Protestants and of sanctioning a stable social and constitutional order, born in revolution but intent upon repudiating revolution as an instrument of change. Newton's mechanical universe . . . became the natural model for the triumph of the Whig constitution.[113]

The Glorious Revolution "gave Protestant bourgeois culture a classical form which was completely lacking in the undiluted Puritan tradition, as we see it in New England at this period," but its effect would be even greater in Catholic France:

> it was in France rather than in England that the revolutionary consequences of the new ideas were most fully realized and the attack on the traditional Christian order was pressed farthest, though the French enlightenment owed much of its success to the achievements of the English revolution and to the influence of English ideas. But in France there was no room for a Whig compromise. The majestic unity of French absolutism and Catholicism stood like a fortress which must be destroyed before the city could be taken by the forces of liberalism and revolution."[114]

One of the first to understand that a new era had dawned when William of Orange became king of England was John Locke, whose *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* appeared in 1690. During the the crucial decade of the 1680s, Locke resided in Rotterdam at the home of Benjamin Furly, a Quaker expatriate whose father had supported the Commonwealth under Cromwell. Furly *pere et fils* had become *personae non gratae* during the Restoration and had repaired to the Low Countries, which had been a safe house for revolutionaries ever since Philip II allowed the Jews to migrate to Antwerp in the mid-16th century. Furly, like Nicholas Barbon, had undergone a subtle evolution in thought in the last half of the 16th century, moving from Enthusiasm to freethinking. He acquired a library of heretical books and attracted a salon willing to discuss the ideas therein. John Locke was one of those freethinkers; at Furly's salon in Rotterdam he met even more radical thinkers in what Jacob described as the Dutch "entrepot between English republicans, Dutch Dissenters, and French refugees"[115] expelled when Louis XIV revoked the Edict of Nantes. These groups shared a common hatred of French Catholic Absolutism. They differed on how to deal with the common enemy. For a moderate like Locke, the answer was constitutionalism. Men of good will and property should unite in free association and establish rules to live as free and equal citizens. The masonic lodge hovered in the background as the model for the new Protestant polity.

At Furly's salon, Locke met Anthony Collins and John Toland, radical Whigs whose views on religion he found appalling. John Toland had been sent to Rotterdam to study for the Presbyterian ministry. While there as a seminarian in the 1690s, he became acquainted with Furly and the freethinkers in his circle. Toland would abandon Presbyterianism to become a Spinozist and a translator of Giordano Bruno, who concluded God and nature were one and the same. Toland emerged in the 1690s as the most radical of the Whigs, "a Protestant for political reasons, but . . . not a Christian."[116] A Protestant for political reasons is another name for revolutionary. Toland would show his devotion to revolution in his writings and by founding one of the first Whig masonic lodges on the continent, the Knights of Jubilation. Toland was the fulfillment of the dreams of Dee and Bruno and the early Rosicrucian brotherhood. His goal wasn't "to abolish the materiality of the world but rather to abolish the immateriality of God."[117] Toland spiritualized matter by

ving it God. In the process he dethroned God as the creator of matter. This nsformation would have serious political consequences.

During the 1680s, before the Whigs came to power after the Glorious olution, they expressed their libertine and anticlerical views at places like ves' Head Club or the Kit-Cat Club, where they would don priest's e and engage in blasphemous rituals, including one in which the pope burned in effigy. Post-revolutionary London became a magnet for this of person until the Whigs, fearing they might be hoist by their own olutionary petard, deported radical foreigners to Holland. Radicals like and Collins went to Holland under different auspices: they were sent ers of the Whig government, to spread ideas which were so subversive the government would never allow their dissemination in England. thew Tindal was a member of the same radical group that sought to reduce istianity to a purely natural religion. Because of the double standard at the of Whig cultural revolutionary politics, Tindal's works were published Dutch but not in English.

To rebut the views of Toland and Collins, Locke would eventually write ok about the reasonableness of Christianity. But there is no indication it influenced their thinking, which tended toward atheism and erialism. Like Furly, Collins and Toland had roots that stretched back the English revolutionary movement of the 1640s, and like Furly they had ed from enthusiasm to freethinking. Out of these discussions was born black operation known as the Enlightenment. The Whigs in England e intoxicated by the political implications of Newton's laws of motion. As masons they knew the physical world was the basis of the political world. meant that some application of Newtonian physics would allow them redict and control political motion. That meant the forces that had led to olutions in the past could now be harnessed so that they would not get out control. The relatively painless trajectory of the Glorious Revolution seemed proof of that proposition. Man could now unleash the forces of nature bout letting them get out of control. Some variant of Newtonian science, was hoped, would come up with the formula which would control human ture, just as Ben Franklin would could control lightning and render it not harmless but useful by storing it in Leyden jars for later use.

This illusion would survive among the Whigs until the French Revolution, which Mary Godwin Shelley, daughter of two Whig radicals, would a more pessimistic view of man's ability to tame the forces of nature in *Frankenstein*. During the 1690s, the Whigs, fresh from securing a new social through scientifically controlled revolution, thought they could use ame forces of nature to bring down the Catholic monarchies of Europe. ing the 1690s, "the driving force behind this political and religious ialism came from England, from a political structure and constitutional established by revolution."[118] Newton claimed his system needed a God,

the Architect of the Universe, to hold it together because motion was not intrinsic to matter. But, like Luther, Newton launched ideas that would sail beyond his intentions. The Newtonian system expelled angels from the universe, and some claimed it expelled God too:

> The mechanical philosophy made it possible to conceive of the universe as matter in motion without the need to postulate a separate and eternal Creator. Republicans converted the result in philosophic pantheism into civic religion, and the dynamics of that credo gave coherence to the Radical Enlightenment throughout the 18th century."[119]

On those terms, the Newtonian system became the vehicle for revolutionary thought on the continent, even though it was used to justify harmony and social order in Whig England.

WHIGS & FREEMASONS IN ENGLAND AND FRANCE

In 1704, three years after the outbreak of the War of Spanish Succession, an 18-year-old Huguenot refugee, Jean Rousset de Missy, arrived in the Hague to start a new life free from the religious oppression of Louis XIV. Rousset de Missy carried with him, like a household god packed hastily for the flight, an abiding hatred for the Bourbon monarchy and the Catholic Church, whose identities Louis XIV had fused, at least in Protestant eyes, when he expelled the Huguenots. In 1705 John Toland coined the term "pantheism" to promote Spinoza's subversive ideas. The term quickly caught on in Holland among the Huguenot exiles, who were abandoning their Calvinism, or secularizing its key concepts, as the children of those who supported Cromwell's Commonwealth were doing in England.

Given his political views, it was natural that Rousset de Missy would run into John Toland or Anthony Collins at Furly's salon in Rotterdam, but by 1705 Toland had an organization of his own that was much more than just a place to discuss radical ideas. Around the time that Toland invented the word "pantheism," he and Anthony Collins founded a secret society known as the Knights of Jubilation in the Hague. We know about it from a paper in Toland's manuscripts entitled, "The Hague, 1710," which described the order and its ceremonies. Toland knew Sir Robert Clayton, and most probably from him he learned about masonic practices and terminology, or he could have learned about secret societies from radical Whig libertines at the Kit-Cat Club, which called its members "Knights" and which staged a procession through London in 1711 culminating in the symbolic immolation of the pope.

By 1710 Toland and Collins had recruited many French Huguenot exiles into the Knights of Jubilation. One was Prosper Marchand, who in 1720 became editor of Bayle's *Dictionnaire*. Rousset de Missy became a member, and he, like Marchand and Levier, would achieve modest fame as a writer, translator, publicist, and propagandist. "Every one of these refugees,"

notes, "possessed an affiliation with the book trade, and this gave them access to the nerve centre of the European Enlightenment. Through their publishing firms and journals they disseminated heterodoxy, the new science, and republicanism to French readers within the republic of letters."[120] Eventually, publishers in the Knights of Jubilation "made contact with a new generation of publishers . . . like Marc Michel Reya . . . [who] became the leading publisher of the High Enlightenment, who gave to the world works by Rousseau, Diderot and d'Holbach, as well as a vast body of materialist and anti-Christian literature."[121]

What has come to be known as the Enlightenment began as the Knights of Jubilation. After attaching themselves to the court of Eugene of Savoy in the Hague, Rousset de Missy and other Huguenot exiles served as agents for the English Whig government during the War of Spanish Succession.[122] As British agents, Rousset de Missy and other Knights of Jubilation infiltrated the Belgian postal system. Beginning in 1706, Francois Jaupian, the postmaster at Brussels and director of the Belgian postal system, received payments from the British government that lasted well into the Walpole administration. Handsomely rewarded, Jaupian easily recruited other Belgian postal officials as British agents. Two, Douxfils and Felbier, were also connected with Eugene of Savoy's court, which administered Belgium for the Austrian Hapsburgs, traditional allies of the English in Holland, to limit the power of the Bourbons, then the most powerful house in Europe. Douxfils' brother-in-law

> eventually married a woman who was to become Voltaire's mistress. Indeed, when Voltaire went to the Netherlands in 1722, via a stop over in Brussels, it was probably Douxfils, a friend of the poet Jean-Baptiste Rousseau, who put Voltaire in touch with Levier and Picart in the Hague [who] . . . tried unsuccessfully to publish Voltaire's epic poem *La Hendriade*.[123]

Douxfils was a Spinozist, i.e., a materialist and a revolutionary subversive, who used the postal system to circulate forbidden materials. For years he received packets from Marchand, Rousset, and other Knights and then passed them to his agents in France who used them in psychological warfare to undermine the Bourbon monarchy.

After 12 years of conflict, the English had grown tired of a seemingly never-ending war in the Netherlands, and the Tories rode that discontent to power in Parliament. As one of their first acts, they concluded the Treaty of Utrecht ending the War of Spanish Succession in 1713. Toland and his cabal of Huguenot publishers were suddenly agents without portfolio, but since their black operation was also a publishing venture, they did not need direct financial support to survive. What began as a spy network became a black operation whose purpose was the subversion of the Bourbon monarchy in France. During his career as publicist in Holland Rousset de Missy became an

enforcer for Whig politics on the continent, whose "overriding goal, from the 1690s until well into the 1750s" was "the subversion of French absolutism."[124] "One goal," we are told, "inspired the advocates of this alliance: the defeat of France, and after the Treaty of Utrecht (1713) when military defeat was no longer possible, the gradual subversion of French absolutism."[125]

After that treaty, the shooting war against France became a propaganda war. Huguenot exiles translated the subversive ideas of radical Whigs like Toland and Collins into French, and those ideas then circulated through the French-speaking world with the cooperation of the Belgian postal officials. Rousset de Missy appropriated Toland's term "pantheism" and soon became its apostle to the French. As a result, "the literature of the Enlightenment, much of it produced in the Netherlands, served to undermine the *ancien regime* in France."[126] In 1714 Toland translated Giordano Bruno's *Spaccio* into English, and Rousset shortly thereafter translated into French the book that proposed that God was infinite matter.

The books the Knights published best show the subversive nature of this enterprise. Works like Voltaire's *Urania*, Toland's masonic liturgy *Pantheisticon*, Diderot's pornographic *Les Bijoux indiscrets*, as well as his Dictionary, and, most importantly, *Le Traite de Trois Imposteurs*, had one common denominator: subversion, either of the faith or the morals of the French. Rousset's colleague Levier also sold pornographic works like *Les Amours pastorales de Daphnis and Chloe* from his shop in the Hague. The book turned up in Baron Hohendorf's library; he probably bought it from Levier.

Pornography would increase in importance through the 18th century. Eventually, pornographers at the Palais Royale under the protection of the Duc d'Orleans would defame Marie Antoinette and destabilize the Bourbon dynasty. Marchand's library, which was probably a catalogue of the subversive books the Knights were channeling into France, was also a catalogue of the intellectual decay of Protestantism. The "intellectual odyssey" that began with Calvin soon made way for "libertine literature, the new science, Toland, Collins, Tindal, works on the Hermetic tradition, hieroglyphs and freemasonry (not to forget a few mildly pornographic, yet philosophical pieces like Diderot's *Les Bijoux indiscrets).*"[127] This use of pornography for political subversion would culminate in the works of the Marquis de Sade, who learned his trade while incarcerated in the Bastille reading works Marchand and his fellow Knights had been disseminating for decades. Rousset de Missy promoted Diderot as the "second La Mettrie," but it was the first La Mettrie, in particular his *L'homme Machine*, which de Sade read avidly in prison, and which inspired de Sade to say "woman is a machine for voluptuousness" in *Justine.*[128]

Enlightenment publishers pursued their literary projects in Holland because "Dutch law enforcement against forbidden books was from city to city almost non-existent, and book dealers who could move their wares about from place to place were particularly immune and therefore particularly

[illegible] the trade in forbidden books."[129] So people like Marchand [illegible] "literary projects" that were "often infused with subversive [illegible] overtones."[130] The subversives were also shrewd businessmen, [illegible] their black operation to continue for decades despite the vagaries of [illegible] politics. The combination of Dutch tolerance and English *laissez faire* [illegible] left "Enlightenment publishers like Marchand relatively free to [illegible] their profession and intellectual interests in the Netherlands. The link [illegible] publishing and the spread of the Enlightenment seemed self-evident [illegible] probably a source of enormous personal pride."[131]

[illegible] Rousset de Missy passed a manuscript to Levier that would have an [illegible] political impact on the *ancien regime*. The *Traite de Trois Imposteurs* [illegible] to show that Moses, Jesus, and Mohammed were frauds, not even [illegible] in the magic they practiced to befuddle the credulous mob. Given [illegible] similarities between the *Traite* and Bruno's *Spaccio*, and the fact that [illegible] would translate the *Spaccio* into English and Rousset would translate [illegible] French, it is likely that Rousset got the manuscript from Toland. The [illegible] of the *Traite* certainly fit in with Toland's ideas. The *Traite* claimed the [illegible] attributed to Moses and Jesus were accomplished by magic. (Toland [illegible] written a manuscript found among his private papers claiming Jesus was [illegible] magician.) Like Jesus, Moses was the son of a magician; Moses became [illegible] Egyptian priest, becoming thereby privy to their "pretended magic" to [illegible] and deceive the "credulous" Hebrews. Freud made similar claims [illegible] Moses, claiming he wasn't really a Jew in *Moses and Monotheism* two [illegible] later.

[illegible] the world's major religious figures discredited, the author of the [illegible] then proposed the new religion of nature as the substitute for the failed [illegible] of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. That new religion was based [illegible] much more radically materialistic science than the Newtonian physics [illegible] Whigs were promoting for general consumption in England. According [illegible] science of nature proposed in the *Traite*, God does not impart motion [illegible] matter. Motion is intrinsic to matter, obviating the need for God, because [illegible] certain that there is in the Universe a very subtle fluid or very thin [illegible] always in motion, whose source is the sun."[132] By the end of the century [illegible] fluid or very thin matter" was known as electricity. After Galvani's [illegible] with frogs' legs—electric shocks would make leg muscles twitch [illegible] though the legs were severed from the frog—electricity had become [illegible] materialist substitute for the soul, the idea Mary Shelley explored, along [illegible] its revolutionary implications, in *Frankenstein*. In electricity, science [illegible] the source of life and movement, making God unnecessary.

[illegible] political implications of the *Traite* were clear. If the universe did not [illegible] God to govern it, then France did not need a king. This view differed [illegible] the Newtonian view, even if the Newtonians shared many of the same [illegible] about the universe. This idea would have been equally subversive

in England, but the Whigs kept it out of England. Toland's books and their Huguenot translations were meant strictly for foreign consumption. Marchand tacitly recognized the revolutionary nature of the *Traite* by cataloguing it with the *Vindiciae contra Tyrannos*, a Huguenot manuscript published in 1579 in the wake of the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre two years before, which "openly advocated rebellion against tyrannical authority."[133] The massacre convinced the author of the *Vindiciae* that political compromise with the French king was impossible. The only solution to Bourbon Catholic tyranny was revolution. Not surprisingly, the *Vindiciae* was translated into English in 1648, one year before the Puritan regicides murdered Charles I. Revolution used freemasonry as its vehicle in France in the 18th century, but the roots of that revolutionary movement went back to the Protestantism of the 16th century, when

> Huguenot revolutionaries belonged to an internationally linked Protestant network that practiced secrecy for survival and that waged bitter war against the Spanish Crown in the Netherlands, and after the Massacre of St Bartholomew's Day, against the French church and its king. The freemasonry to which Rousset and his friends were drawn fulfilled many of the same social needs as did the Calvinist churches, and like those churches in their time of persecution, but for very different reasons, it too was secret and international in scope.[134]

Freemasonry was secularized Calvinism. The Elect became Lodge brothers through the alembic of time. Despite changes in names, the revolutionary distillate was the same in its essence, hatred for the Catholic social order of Europe, once embodied in the Hapsburgs of Spain but now embodied in the Bourbons of France. Like the *Traite*, its secularized version, "the *Vindiciae* offered a powerful critique of absolutism and one that was compatible with the beliefs held by Whig radicals."[135] The Knights of Jubilation and their publishing arm continued the work publishers like Plantin had started at the time of the Iconoclast rebellion. Christopher Plantin

> built one of the finest and largest publishing businesses of the later 16th century. In Antwerp, he had the lucrative right to publish Bibles for the Spanish king; in secret he belonged to a radical sect, the Family of Love, and surreptitiously published works by its leaders. The liberal beliefs and secret practices of this sect have often been seen as foreshadowing those of freemasonry.[136]

Plantin's works ended up in the library of Baron Hohendorf, advisor to Eugene of Savoy, as part of "over a century of semi-clandestine Protestant opposition, first to Spanish and then to French absolutism."[137]

The alliance of the Knights with the radical fringe of the Whig Party was intended to serve British interests in Northern Europe. Whig policy demanded creation of an Anglophile party in the Netherlands, and in their

[illegible] activities the Knights and their Dutch associates contributed to that [illegible]. "It is hard to believe that these French refugees were unfamiliar with [illegible] doctrines or hostile to its advocacy of rebellion before their arrival in the [illegible]."[138] Rousset carried this hostility with him when he left France to [illegible] the Holland Whig party" in the Hague, where he was an enforcer of [illegible] Whig party line. He did this mostly through the "enormous volume of [illegible] political propaganda, most of it in support of Whig foreign policy and the [illegible] Protestant alliance of the Maritime Powers and Austria."[139]

[illegible] Rousset de Missy founded a journal in Holland that he modeled on *The* [illegible], a weekly British magazine on politics, culture, and current affairs. [illegible] In acting as a conduit for Whig ideas, he often failed to recognize that ideas [illegible] acceptable on the continent, where they could subvert the French monarchy, [illegible] not acceptable in England, where the Whigs did not want the monarchy [illegible] perverted. Rousset must have experienced considerable embarrassment [illegible] when *The Spectator* attacked his mentors Toland and Collins as dangerous [illegible] subversives. Since Whig foreign policy was masonic, it is not surprising that it [illegible] would have exoteric truths as the basis of its domestic policy and more radical [illegible] esoteric truths as the source of its foreign policy. The party line in England [illegible] was different from that in Holland, as Rousset was to discover.

The exoteric/esoteric distinction throws light on one of the hoariest [illegible] issues in freemasonry: whether the Continental lodges were more subversive [illegible] than the English lodges. Abbe Barruel defended this thesis in *Memoirs pour* [illegible] *servir à l'Histoire de Jacobinisme* at the end of the 18th century. The masonic [illegible] constitution of 1723 specifically excluded "an irreligious libertine or a stupid [illegible] atheist"[140] from membership. The formulation is radically and probably [illegible] deliberately ambiguous. Would the Lodge welcome religious libertines and [illegible] intelligent atheists? Probably. Similarly, the Continental/English dichotomy [illegible] can be resolved easily enough. Masonry could have advocated the same ideas [illegible] in England and France, but those ideas, which would have been radically [illegible] subversive in France, would have been a description of the status quo in [illegible] England after the Glorious Revolution. Steele's denunciation of the Radical [illegible] Whigs, i.e., the ideas of Toland and Collins, in *The Spectator*, indicates that [illegible] what was considered toxic by the Whigs at home was also considered good for [illegible] export to France.

[illegible] Toland used the masons as his vehicle to spread subversive ideas on the [illegible] continent. Between 1710 and 1726, when Voltaire arrived in England, Toland's [illegible] ideas were circulating through France and condemned in England. Since the [illegible] ideas were condemned in Whig journals in England and since Toland had [illegible] close contact with Whig ministers in government in England and "Dutch [illegible] Whigs" like William and Charles Bentinck, it is safe to assume that Whigs [illegible] like Walpole used the radicals as pawns to spread revolution on the continent. [illegible] The Tories always claimed the Whig party was "infested with irreligion, [illegible] libertines, atheists and deists and the charge was not without merit."[141]

The Whigs, however, were playing a double game, and agents like Toland and Collins, and Huguenot allies like Rousset de Missy, could learn their trade by attaching "themselves to political patrons in England and courts on the continent not as philosophers but as polemicists, spies and official historians."[142] Rousset became a revolutionary himself in 1747 after a career of propagating revolutionary ideas.

There is an alternative reading to the claim that Whigs used the radicals as pawns to spread revolution on the continent. Perhaps the radicals used the Whigs to spread radical ideas the Whigs would have found appalling. Jacob claims that, in carrying out the northern alliance against France, the radicals operating as "official pamphleteers, spies, agents and messengers" were "in fact advancing their own views as well as forging vital links in the publishing enterprise that lay at the heart of the Enlightenment and that sought to undermine both Church and State in France."[143]

One way to resolve these conflicting explanations is to see the Enlightenment as a Whig sponsored black operation that got out of control, as black operations tend to do. By 1747 when he became a leader in the Dutch Revolution, Rousset de Missy was most probably intoxicated by his own rhetoric. It is unlikely he was operating on direct orders from Whitehall. The same could be said *a fortiori* of the French Revolution, which English Whigs hoped would unfold like a Gallic version of the Glorious Revolution, but which took on its own trajectory, and certainly, by the time of Napoleon, not one that made Whigs happy.

Although he was officially *persona non grata* in England, Toland's ideas continued to circulate on the continent. He, more than anyone, was responsible for the spread of Spinoza's ideas, which were viewed with increasing alarm, especially among Germans, whose familiarity with the Jews led them to view Spinoza with suspicion. As early as 1699, Johann Georg Wachter attacked Spinoza in *Spinozisme dans le Judaisme, ou le monde deifie par le Judaisme d'aujourd'hui et sa cabale secrete.* Kant felt Spinoza was a dangerous Jewish revolutionary, a Cabalist who got his ideas from Giordano Bruno. Spinoza was familiar with Bruno's writings and had written a dialogue in his manner as a young man. Bruno taught that "*Natura est Deus in rebus et in Deo immenso, spaccio, et summa terminorum*," and so unsurprisingly this idea found its way into the writings of John Toland, who promoted Bruno and Spinoza. Voltaire cited Toland in 1734 and linked him to Spinoza.

If pressed on the issue of religion, Toland probably would have taken the position of the *Traite de Trois Imposteurs* that all religions were fraudulent. In practice, he came down harder on Christianity, claiming (if he was the author of the *Traite*) that Jesus was ignorant of even the Egyptian magic Moses knew. By 1714, Toland was praising the Jews, claiming they "honor one supreme being or First Cause and obey the law of Nature."[144] Toland was also the first 18th century thinker to espouse "the cause of religious toleration for the Jews."[145]

newfound sympathy may have a masonic connection. Freemasonry ...ed to be a religion that could be acceptable to all. The English lodges, at ... were admitting more and more Jews. This was another instance of ideas ... were considered tame in England but subversive elsewhere. The German ... had conflicts with the Grand Lodge in London over the admission ... Germans did not want Jews in their lodges, but they were forced to ...ept them by the English. The Amsterdam lodge, "where a pantheist and ...a follower of John Toland served for many years as Master of its lodge," ...owed the English lead in admitting Jews.[146]

...ottfried Wilhelm von Leibniz was a moderate Protestant who hoped ...ring about reconciliation with Catholicism. Leibniz, who is credited ...g with Newton with the invention of calculus, was familiar with the ...wtonian system but skeptical about its claims. Leibniz felt Newton's use ...gravity was occult or magical. He was convinced Newton's inability to ...plain how gravity was the will of God operating in the universe according ...echanical principles played into the hands of materialists and atheists. ...wtonian physics was, despite Newton's attempts to make it compatible ...h Whig conceptions of social order, deeply subversive in Leibnitz's view. ...e probably felt this way because he had met John Toland in 1702 when ...land arrived in the Hague as part of an English delegation to work out ...Act of Succession with the Hanoverian line. Toland was attached to the ...publican Whig section of the delegation, but Leibniz thought he was a spy ...d a materialist who had adopted the atomic principle of Lucretius.

Leibniz kept the memory of the encounter alive for over a decade before ...ting *Monadology* in 1714 to counter the politically subversive materialism ...the heart of the English ideology spreading through Europe. "Leibniz ...ew perfectly well that Eugene's circle at The Hague had been a center for ...ertines, freethinkers and radicals who saw in him their hope to defeat ...rtarily the French search for European hegemony."[147] The *Monadology* was ...niz's warning about Newton and his followers. For his pains, he was left ...ed in Hanover to write a history when George became king of England ...717. The mood in England was changing as disillusionment with the ...rious Revolution was stifled under the spread of a new worldview that ...s an amalgam of Newtonian science and masonic politics in the service of ...ig ideology.

The Catholic Church Condemns Freemasonry

...717 two Protestant clergymen, Dr. John Theosophilis Desaguliers and ...James Anderson, met at the Apple Tree Tavern in London and created a ...ming authority for the lodges in England known as the Grand Lodge. ...ing the 16 years between the death of James II in 1701 and the founding of ...Grand Lodge, Stuart Freemasonry was driven into exile in France with the

Jacobites who fled there in 1690, after which it went underground in England and Scotland, making its history almost impossible to trace. In reorganizing the lodges under one central authority, Desaguliers and Anderson redefined their identity, making them an adjunct of the Whig party.

James Anderson was a Scots Presbyterian minister who supported the Glorious Revolution that drove fellow Scot James II from the throne and handed it to the Dutch usurper. Given his political sympathies, it is not surprising that Anderson left Aberdeen in 1710 and moved to London, where he took over a congregation in Swallow Street. There he espoused Erastian views, attacking Freethinkers, Unitarians, Jacobites—the same people, with the exception of the Jacobites, the Whigs were promoting on the continent. Anderson wrote Whig propaganda for members of the Lodge and was recognized as the author of the new masonic Constitution in 1723. Jacob calls Anderson's Constitutions "an extraordinary example of political propaganda."[148]

Many were upset with the new Constitutions, viewing them not as a codification of what masons believed but as a distortion of those beliefs for political purposes. Given Anderson's role as a Whig propagandist, this is not surprising. Professor John Robison, whose *Proofs of a Conspiracy* introduced Barruel's writings on the French Revolution to Americans, accused Anderson of falsifying masonic history for political purposes. He deplored Anderson's book as "the heap of rubbish with which Anderson disgraced his Constitutions of Free Masonry"[149] because it excluded the Scottish traditions Walpole thought fatally associated with the Jacobites. Robison says the Jacobites

> took Free Masonry with them to the continent, where it was immediately received by the French and was cultivated with great zeal in a manner suited to the taste and habits of that highly cultivated people. The Lodges in France naturally became the rendezvous of the adherents of their banished King, and the means of carrying on a correspondence with their friends in England.[150]

Walpole probably encouraged Anderson and Desaguliers to take over the English lodges because he understood the role the Ecossais Lodges had played in the restoration of Charles II to the throne. If those lodges "scattered across Europe" in "established clandestine masonic networks," were left unhindered, it was only a matter of time before history repeated itself and the lodges put an offspring of James II on the throne.[151]

Walpole's best allies were Huguenot exiles. Desaguliers was a Huguenot refugee initiated into the Lodge in 1713 and inducted as a member of the Royal Society one year later. He studied under John Keill at Oxford and was considered proficient enough in Newtonian science to take over his mentor's lectures on Newton when Keill was away. After graduation, Desaguliers became a lecturer in Newtonian science. Newton was the godfather of one

Jacobites who fled there in 1690, after which it went underground in England and Scotland, making its history almost impossible to trace. In reorganizing the lodges under one central authority, Desaguliers and Anderson redefined their identity, making them an adjunct of the Whig party.

James Anderson was a Scots Presbyterian minister who supported the Glorious Revolution that drove fellow Scot James II from the throne and handed it to the Dutch usurper. Given his political sympathies, it is not surprising that Anderson left Aberdeen in 1710 and moved to London, where he took over a congregation in Swallow Street. There he espoused Erastian views, attacking Freethinkers, Unitarians, Jacobites—the same people, with the exception of the Jacobites, the Whigs were promoting on the continent. Anderson wrote Whig propaganda for members of the Lodge and was recognized as the author of the new masonic Constitution in 1723. Jacob calls Anderson's Constitutions "an extraordinary example of political propaganda."[148]

Many were upset with the new Constitutions, viewing them not as a codification of what masons believed but as a distortion of those beliefs for political purposes. Given Anderson's role as a Whig propagandist, this is not surprising. Professor John Robison, whose *Proofs of a Conspiracy* introduced Barruel's writings on the French Revolution to Americans, accused Anderson of falsifying masonic history for political purposes. He deplored Anderson's book as "the heap of rubbish with which Anderson disgraced his Constitutions of Free Masonry"[149] because it excluded the Scottish traditions Walpole thought fatally associated with the Jacobites. Robison says the Jacobites

> took Free Masonry with them to the continent, where it was immediately received by the French and was cultivated with great zeal in a manner suited to the taste and habits of that highly cultivated people. The Lodges in France naturally became the rendezvous of the adherents of their banished King, and the means of carrying on a correspondence with their friends in England.[150]

Walpole probably encouraged Anderson and Desaguliers to take over the English lodges because he understood the role the Ecossais Lodges had played in the restoration of Charles II to the throne. If those lodges "scattered across Europe" in "established clandestine masonic networks," were left unhindered, it was only a matter of time before history repeated itself and the lodges put an offspring of James II on the throne.[151]

Walpole's best allies were Huguenot exiles. Desaguliers was a Huguenot refugee initiated into the Lodge in 1713 and inducted as a member of the Royal Society one year later. He studied under John Keill at Oxford and was considered proficient enough in Newtonian science to take over his mentor's lectures on Newton when Keill was away. After graduation, Desaguliers became a lecturer in Newtonian science. Newton was the godfather of one

of Desagulier's children, so we can assume the Master approved of what he had to say.

After 1717 Desaguliers turned the lodges into vehicles for the new science and Whig politics, even putting into verse the political implications of the Newtonian system in "The Newtonian System of the World: The Best Model of Government." Masonic promotion of Newton provided an alternative to the Cartesianism triumphant on the continent. It also provided the theoretical foundation for limited monarchy as an alternative to the absolutism promoted by Bourbons on the continent. Jacob finds it unsurprising that "Whig oligarchs and their placemen flocked to masonic lodges whose spokesmen offered so much confirmation to their self esteem and insured the cosmic significance of their activities."[152]

The 1717 re-organization of the Lodge was really a redefinition as well. Newtonians and Whig agents presided over the expulsion of the Jacobites and redefined the lodges into something which was less Christian and more attractive to revolutionary subversives and Jews. This was especially true on the continent. Anderson and Desaguliers redefined the faith of the lodge, turning it away from its Jacobite philo-Catholic masonic base into "the Religion in which all men can agree." The Whigs and Newtonians who refined the craft put it on a trajectory toward secularism and subversion. According to its adherents, freemasonry was not only the *prisca theologia* Reuchlin had sought in vain, it was the true religion because it was based on the foundation of all religion. "Masonry," according to Albert Pike, its most influential American spokesman, "teaches, and has preserved in their purity, the cardinal tenets of the old primitive faith, which underlie and are the foundation of all religion. . . . Masonry is the universal morality which is suitable to the inhabitants of every clime, to the man of every creed."[153] According to Sir John Cockburn: "Creeds arise, have their day and pass, but masonry remains. It is built on the rock of truth, not on the shifting sands of superstition."[154]

This redefinition meant masonry would attract a different sort of person than the Ecossais Jacobite lodges of the 17th century had attracted. The changes in philosophy and criteria of admission made it more attractive to Jews, who began joining in greater numbers. "Jews," according to Whalen, "might well feel at home in the lodge since the Hiram Abiff legend was built on the Old rather than the New Testament and the Craft borrowed most of its terminology from the Hebrew. The core of masonry, that mankind has suffered a great loss which eventually will be recovered, could easily be understood to mean the loss of the Temple and of Jewish Nationhood."[155]

The Catholic Church abetted the change when Pope Clement VI condemned freemasonry in 1738. The exclusion of Catholics combined with the preponderance of Jews and Freethinkers turned the lodges into agencies of subversion, especially in Catholic countries, where "only religious rebels and Jews sought admission to the lodges. This concentration of atheists,

agnostics, freethinkers, Jews, and anti-clericals turned Latin masonry into a subversive and hostile critic of Christianity and all religions."[156] This trend toward secularism also created tension with the Mother Lodge in London, where tradition and precedent were honored over the rationalism reigning on the continent. The continental lodges took the secular principles they imbibed from England to their logical conclusion. "When the Grand Orient of France in 1877 rejected the landmark of belief in God and removed the Bible from the lodges, the Anglo-Saxons severed fraternal relations, which have never been resumed."[157]

Membership in the post-1717 lodges was attractive to Jews and Freethinkers for a number of reasons. In addition to being a practical vehicle for Jewish science or Cabala, the lodge also espoused the goal of Jewish revolutionaries since Simon bar Kokhba: heaven on earth. "Masonic literature . . . offered the lodge as the foundation for earthly happiness. It provided an ethical system that emphasized fraternity and equality as well as the value of liberty."[158] It was also deliberately ambiguous about revolution as the means to attain heaven on earth. The Constitutions of 1723 specifically forbade expulsion as punishment for fomenting revolution. The reason for this ambiguity is not hard to discern. Masons were supposed to be loyal to the Whig Glorious Revolution, i.e., the status quo in England, and they were also to promote the same Whig philosophy in Catholic countries on the continent, where it was seditious and revolutionary.

The man chiefly responsible for this dual policy was Sir Robert Walpole, Whig statesman and prime minister during the first two decades of the 18th century. When the Elector of Hanover arrived in England to ascend to the throne in 1714, he was greeted almost immediately by the legacy of the usurpers who invited him. The Jacobite rising of 1715 happened within a year of his coronation. Having failed to start a rebellion among the Scots, the Jacobites tried to interest the Swedes in the Jacobite-Swedish plot of 1716. After the foundation of the Grand Lodge, Walpole was determined to use it to purge active Jacobite elements from other lodges. That battle between the "antients" and "modern" Freemasons continued for a century. The Whigs won the battle in England, but lost it elsewhere, notably in America, where "antient" anti-Whig Freemasonry played a significant role in the American Revolution.

Walpole used masons with Whig sympathies to spy on their Jacobite brothers. Huguenot refugees proved themselves "especially loyal to the movement," and "they often also made devoted servants of the government."[159] Jacob claims David Papillon was "a member of the Royal Society's inner circle," who "acted as a personal agent for Walpole, and probably as a spy," because "his name turns up in the correspondents' list of the Grand Lodge of the Netherlands in The Hague. He also felt close enough to Walpole to recommend candidates for offices."[160] M. La Roche, a French Huguenot lodge

member at Prince Eugen's Head coffee house on St. Alban's street, spied on the Jacobites in Paris. Walpole sent Martin Bladen, a mason, on a mission to Paris in 1719. Like Bladen and La Roche, Ralph de Courteville, "loyally served Walpole as a spy on the Jacobites and as a writer of Whig propaganda for the *London Journal*."[161] All Whig agents on the continent eventually made contact with the Knights of Jubilation. In 1721, after receiving an assignment from Walpole, Philip von Stosch, Walpole's spy and art dealer, deposited his papers with Levier before leaving on his mission. After Levier's death, another Walpole agent, Peter August Samson, "wrote to his widow, also a publisher, to send greetings and regards for the '*maison d'Walpole*.'"[162]

Walpole was, of course, a mason himself, and he used Houghton Hall, his home, for the initiation of Francis, Duke of Lorraine, into the Lodge in 1731. As a member of the Lodge, Walpole was aware of shifting currents of internal politics in the Lodge. He was also aware that most lodges in France were founded by Jacobites and had Jacobite sympathies. After the abortive Jacobite rebellion of 1715, Walpole added offices to the king's payroll to extend Whig control over the Scots, including a royal liaison, "the king's mason," to the rebellious Scottish masons.

During the first three decades of the 18th century, the Scottish operative lodges were consolidated and reformed as speculative lodges in a move paralleling Whig ascendancy in parliament and administration. Before long, phrases from Anderson's Constitutions showed up in meetings of the operative lodges in Scotland. The first reference to the "secret mysteries of masonry" occurred as power shifted to "gentleman Freemasons" to the detriment of their "operative" brothers. The protective nature of the lodges as vocational guilds was abandoned in favor of free trade policies that weakened the lodges' economic standing but increased the power of the Whigs in London. The economic power of the guilds to regulate trade was destroyed and replaced by appeals to "freedom" and prosperity that would accrue from the new economic system. "By the 1720s the power of the craft guilds had been almost entirely broken by free-market economic pressures in England and Scotland."[163]

When the Jacobite Duke of Wharton tried to take control of the lodges in the 1720s, Walpole made sure that the effort was thwarted. "He should take care" Walpole warned Wharton; his "concern. . . conveyed through his elaborate system of spies and agents is that an English aristocratic order, now rendered loyal to the Hanoverians, should not be sullied by Wharton's Jacobite activities."[164] French masonic lodges were Jacobite and anti-Newtonian, as exemplified by the Chevalier Andrew Michael Ramsay. Eventually Ramsay was admitted to the Horn Lodge of London, not because he converted to Whig Newtonian views, but because he was amenable to working with the opposing group of masons. Throughout the 1720s, Walpole continued to purge the lodge of Jacobite sympathizers and turned it into "a uniquely Hanoverian social institution, an embodiment of the Newtonian Enlightenment and

officially dedicated to the ideology of court Whiggery."[165] Radical Whigs like Toland and Collins, disillusioned with the direction Whiggery took after the Glorious Revolution, were not expelled; they were simply invited to spread their revolutionary ideas on the continent where they would do the most good, most notably in the Dutch Republic. Gradually, the masonic lodges founded in the aftermath of James II's exile in France after 1690 were eclipsed by those founded under Whig auspices during the first three decades of the 18th century. "The freemasonry that we find throughout Europe in the period beginning in the 1730s appears to owe more to England that it does to Scotland."[166]

Under the increasing cultural influence of the Whig inspired lodges of the 1720s, radical ideas flowed from Holland south into France. The subversion leaching from Holland became a major bone of contention between the French and the Dutch. Louis XIV's agents kept close watch, even if they were unable to stop it. During the 1720s, Parisian cafes, like the Café de Procope, were centers of subversive Whig ideas, which Huguenot operatives had translated into French for consumption in France. The legend of Cromwell as a Freemason started then, an erroneous idea that circulated through France and created sympathy for regicide. By the 1720s, radicalism, directly related to subversive literature emanating from Holland, had established several intellectual beachheads in France. When the French police raided the shop of the Rouen journalist Bonnet, they found copies of *L'Esprit de Spinoza*, and an edition of *Le Traite de Trois Imposteurs*, which included a life of Spinoza. By 1721, there was an unofficial lodge in Rotterdam, where initiates could talk about the religion of Nature and other dangerous ideas emanating from England.

The French police, who had to contend with the dissemination of these tracts, considered freemasonry a subversive import from England from the beginning. Cardinal Fleury, Louis' prime minister, banned the importation of subversive and masonic material, but to little effect. The French government could do little to stop the clandestine lodge meetings, and it could do even less to stop the clandestine spread of subversive material that provided the main topic of discussion at Lodge meetings. As early as the 1720s, police had attempted to break up lodge meetings because in them, "enemies of order seek to weaken in people's spirits the principles of religion and of subordination to the Powers, established by God."[167]

VOLTAIRE DIES WITHOUT THE SACRAMENT

In 1722 François Marie Arouet was an unknown but ambitious French writer who had written a long poem glorifying the French king he thought most resembled the constitutional monarchs who were the crowning achievement of English culture in the wake of the Glorious Revolution. The English king

was a German, and the poem, known as *La Hendriade*, which sang the praises of the tolerant and enlightened King Henry IV, king of France from 1598 to 1610, was written in French, but none of this mattered to the young Arouet, who would later become famous under the name of Voltaire.

The first stop on Voltaire's road to fame was Brussels, where he first heard of radical republican publishers in the Hague who might be interested in an epic poem written in French that glorified things English. *La Ligue*, as the poem was known then, glorified religious toleration. It was not a radical tract like *Traite de Trois Imposteurs*, but the publishers of the *Traite* were interested nonetheless. Lured by the prospect of a lucrative book deal, Voltaire made his way to the Hague, where he made contact with the literary circle of Marchand, Levier, and Rousset de Missy that was secretly known as the Knights of Jubilation. Voltaire also met the illustrator Bernard Picart. Together the knights expressed interest in bringing out Voltaire's poem. But the deal fell through, and Voltaire returned to Paris with his epic poem unpublished.

After his return, an anonymous poem describing Voltaire's trip to Holland circulated in Paris. In it, Voltaire was accused of attending a "*pantomime indiscret*" at an Amsterdam synagogue, part of a "*culte secret*" run by Dutch rabbis.[168] Voltaire would never be described as a philo-Semite, so it seems unlikely he would have attended synagogue services, even though it was theoretically possible. The poem probably articulated the same inchoate suspicions that surrounded Descartes when he returned from Germany in search of the "Invisibles." Jacob speculates what the popular mind perceived as a "*pantomime indiscret*" conducted by the Dutch rabbis was a masonic ritual conducted by the Knights of Jubilation, the secret society the radical Whigs Toland and Collins founded to recruit angry Huguenot refugees. Jacob concludes "Almost certainly, Voltaire got his first taste of republicanism, both theoretic and practical, from this early trip to the Netherlands," but if he met the Knights of Jubilation, he got more than just a "first taste of republicanism."[169] He also made contact with the continental Whig network of masonic agents promoting subversive ideas among the French. An ambitious young Frenchman like Voltaire could be even more useful to Walpole than Huguenot exiles because Voltaire lived in Paris, the center of the empire the Whigs wanted to subvert.

In 1725, Voltaire met the Whig spy Bacon Morris. The "Honorable Governor Bacon Morris" would eventually become one of the subscribers who made publication of the English edition of Voltaire's *Hendriade* possible in 1728. In 1724 Morris was in Rome, collaborating with Walpole's spy and "art dealer" von Stosch on a mission which involved Walpole's brother Horatio, the British Ambassador to Paris. The Jacobites in Rome suspected Morris was sent by Walpole to spy on them. Morris carried a gun in Rome and he once approached the Pretender to the English throne on a street, presumably with the gun on his person. Shortly thereafter, an attempt was made on Morris's

life, and the Pretender became so alarmed that he went directly to the pope, who ordered his secret service, which had Morris under surveillance, to deport him to France.

Bacon Morris returned to France desperately ill, but during 1725, he recovered his health, and he and Voltaire became acquainted and frequented the same circles. Viscount Percival would later refer to Morris as "an infamous man and a spy,"[170] in what seems the common assessment of his character among the English nobility. Even though Voltaire knew Morris was a secret agent of the British, he cultivated him as a contact, probably because Voltaire understood the deep grammar of English espionage, and how contact with the Whig network could foster his career. Foulet claims Voltaire's "*curiosite naturelle*" made him unable to resist the temptation to gather and share secrets with the English prime minister. If so, Morris was the crucial contact with power in England.

In 1726, Voltaire sailed for England carrying letters of recommendation from the British ambassador to Paris, Horatio Walpole. Voltaire almost certainly got those letters at the behest of Bacon Morris, who acted as Walpole's spy and agent in Rome. Because he arrived under these auspices, Voltaire was treated with suspicion and distrust by a certain segment of the English aristocracy. Crowley says Voltaire was "treated with distrust and reserve in England"[171] because the aristocracy knew of his connections with Morris. He also claims this is the reason behind the puzzling fact that Voltaire, "the apostle of English ideas,"[172] never returned to England even after achieving fame as a promoter of everything English.

In England, the Whigs certainly did not treat Voltaire with suspicious reserve. They received him graciously and introduced him to the leading lights of the Whig regime in government and science. They also arranged publication of his poem *La Hendriade*, enlisting even the support of George I, because "His epic. . . fitted precisely with the reigning political ideology of court and ministerial government, and with the king's new political strategy of trying to render Anglo-French relations cordial and make the French pro-Hanoverian and anti-Jacobite."[173] The ease with which Voltaire found support from the Whig government led many to conclude he was on their payroll as their spy.

The poet Alexander Pope was one of those who accused Voltaire of being a Whig spy. The charge was leveled in public when Owen Ruffhead's *Life of Alexander Pope* was published. In a conversation with Warburton, Pope claimed Voltaire met with him at Twickenham, Pope's country estate. During the visit, Voltaire pumped Pope, a Catholic, for information that made its way to Walpole, causing Pope to wonder whether Voltaire was Walpole's spy. The charge was never refuted. Voltaire's meteoric rise to fame was too puzzling to explain by appealing merely to his literary merit. He had gone in a few short years from being a prisoner in the Bastille to having an audience with

the King of England and being entertained by the Walpoles and the most powerful Whig magnates in the land traditionally seen as France's ancestral enemy. This was too implausible if literary merit were the explanation. The facts "throw suspicion on Voltaire."[174] He was the undoubted beneficiary of Whig patronage. "If he was not paid for his services, he should have been."[175] Jacob said that of Rousset de Missy, but it was equally applicable to Voltaire.

The Whigs certainly got their money's worth when Voltaire became their publicity agent. During his three years in England, Voltaire met with Samuel Clarke and other prominent Newtonians, and after digesting Newton's system, launched a violent attack on Descartes, the *fons et origo* of continental philosophy. He attacked everyone the Whigs thought worthy of attacking, including the radicals of the English revolution (*"ces peoples de Sectaires, Trembleurs, Independants, Puritans, Unitaires"*). Years later in 1768, when the salon of Baron d'Holbach brought out the old Knights of Jubiliation favorite *La Traite de trois imposteurs*, Voltaire attacked his former Dutch promoters as dangerous atheists. D'Holbach's republication of the *Traite* evoked Voltaire's famous *mot*, "if God did not exist he would have to be invented."

In 1729 Voltaire returned to France, where he became the "apostle of English ideas," promoting constitutional government, *laissez faire* economics, intellectual "freedom," freemasonry, and Newtonian physics. Voltaire, as the dispute with Baron d'Holbach indicated, was no radical, and for that reason he was more dangerous to the *ancien regime* than more extreme visionaries. Voltaire insisted on the existence of God, who, through Newtonian physics, became the constitutional monarch of the universe, a Deity who did not interfere. The exoteric god of the Christians was also helpful in keeping shopkeepers and chambermaids in line. These ideas were commonplace in England, but they were revolutionary in France.

In 1733 Voltaire published *Lettres philosophiques*, a piece of Whig propaganda that had an immense influence in France. In it, Voltaire promoted English government and, more importantly for France, English science, as the sure foundation of a better form of government in France, free of intellectual and economic restrictions. Voltaire became the moderate foundation upon which radicals like Diderot and de la Mettrie could erect the edifice of revolution. Four years after his return to France, he praised England as heaven on earth, singling out Newton and Locke as "the greatest minds of the human race." Voltaire was one of the earliest and most famous of a long line of Whig propagandists and agents of influence that stretches from the 18th century to the present day, including Henry Fielding, Edmund Burke, Russell Kirk, and William F. Buckley. Voltaire's ideas "became the creed of an organized party, which gained adherents wherever the influence of French culture was dominant, from Berlin to Naples."[176]

That propaganda would have a devastating effect on the monolith of Church and State that the Baroque Bourbon monarchy had become after the

Counter Reformation. French absolutism was an all or nothing proposition, and when its foundation was undermined that whole world collapsed like a house of cards. Freemasonry was the crucial link between Calvin and Voltaire. Freemasonry enabled the secularization of Calvinist concepts like predestination and the rule of the Elect. And the secularization of those concepts gave them a new lease on life. Voltaire waited until the end of his life before he became a mason. When he was initiated into the Lodge of the Nine Sisters, Benjamin Franklin was there to welcome him. By then it was a work of supererogation; Voltaire had done his revolutionary work for the lodge outside of the lodge, and he was superseded by the lodge as well, just as soon the lodge would be superseded like a single candle when the revolutionary sun rose over France a few years later.

Joining the lodge had unintended consequences for Voltaire, who was in the habit of calling upon the priests of the wretch whenever he was near death. "During Voltaire's residence in Saxony," Barruel writes,

> where Mr. Dieze served him as a secretary, he fell dangerously ill. As soon as he was apprised of his situation he sent for a priest, confessed to him, and begged to receive the sacrament, which he actually did receive, showing all the exterior signs of repentance, which lasted as long as his danger; but as soon as that was over, he affected to laugh at what he called his littleness, and turning to Mr. Dieze, "My friend (said he) you have seen the weakness of the man."[177]

Voltaire made a habit of signing his letters "*Ecrasez l'infame*," or "Crush the Wretch," in reference to the Catholic Church. After joining the lodge, Voltaire had the unwelcome support of brothers who made sure he didn't fall into the wretch's hands before he died. Sensing the end was near, Voltaire summoned a priest in writing on February 26, 1778, but the masons made sure the priest wasn't available in May, when death was at the door and Voltaire, "in spite of all the Sophisters flocking around him," was crying out, "Oh, Christ! Oh, Jesus Christ!" calling for aid from the wretch he had sworn to crush. Voltaire died on May 30, 1778, "worn out by his own fury. . . the most unrelenting Conspirator against Christianity that had been seen since the time of the Apostles. His persecution, longer and more perfidious that those of Nero or Diocletian, had yet only produced apostates; but they were more numerous than the martyrs made in the former persecutions."[178] Twenty-five years before he died, Voltaire predicted the French Revolution in a letter: "Everything is preparing the way to a great revolution, which will most undoubtedly take place; and I shall not be fortunate enough to see it. The French arrive at every thing slowly, but still they do arrive. Light has so gradually diffused itself, that on the first opportunity the nation will break out, and the uproar will be glorious. Happy those who are now young, for they will behold most extraordinary things."[179]

A VIRTUE OF THE FRATERNITY DEFY AUTHORITY AND VIOLATE RULES

As a result of Voltaire's work, the masonic god found many worshippers in the Francophone world during the mid-18th century. By the 1730s lodges were established in large cities of northern and western Europe as outposts of English culture, promoting ideas that were subversive in Catholic countries. By the mid-18th century freemasonry had spread across Europe, but the lodges were concentrated mostly in northern and western Europe, especially in the densely populated corridor between Amsterdam and Paris. By 1750 some 50,000 men belonged to lodges, which existed in every major European city. By the end of the 1780s, there were approximately 35,000 Freemasons in France alone and 10,000 in Paris.

During the first few decades of the 18th century, the French lodges tended to be Jacobite, and the Dutch lodges tended to be Whig, "often sponsored by official Representatives of the British government."[180] All lodges, whether Jacobite or Whig, "carried with them British political culture and mores."[181] Wherever freemasonry was established, the lodge was an outpost of British influence. The Knights of Jubilation became a model:

> the lodges on the Continent . . . embodied British cultural values associated with the potentially subversive: religious toleration, relaxed fraternizing among men of mixed, and widely disparate, social backgrounds, an ideology of work and merit, and, not least, government by constitutions and elections. By the 1730s all these values were the prized ideals of a cultural movement that laid claim to the secular and the modern, that came to be called the Enlightenment.[182]

When the first official Whig lodge on the continent was established in the Hague in 1731, the British ambassador was a charter member. Another was Jean Desaguliers, the Newtonian acolyte. His presence was a sure indication of the political direction that lodge was going to take—as was the presence of Jean Rousset de Missy, one of its chief organizers. If there were any doubts, they disappeared when that lodge named Vincent La Capelle, a member of the London Lodge and the chef de cuisine to William IV of Holland, as its head.

The presence of Rousset insured the lodge would be pro-Orangist and anti-French, which insured it would be viewed with suspicion by the 200 or so Calvinist families who ruled Holland and felt that peace with France best served their economic interests. The Hague lodge was seen from its inception as a subversive organization, created to promote British interests in the cold war against France. And so it probably was no surprise Holland closed the lodge as "an improper gathering. . . an unseemly conventicle."[183]

Dutch freemasonry was illegal after 1735, but it nevertheless continued its rapid expansion. Those lodges remained stubbornly Orangist; they regained

their legal status when they restored the Stadholder William IV during the Dutch revolution of 1747. These lodges remained true to their British roots, and their ideas, "transmitted clandestinely by the radicals and later officially by Whig politicians, provided the social milieu of the Radical Enlightenment on the Continent."[184] In analyzing the radical ideas disseminated by Dutch lodges but not the Master Lodge in London, Jacob claims to see

> no small irony in the perception that these European radicals, who supported English interests on the Continent . . . unwittingly helped to promote the interest of an aristocratic and commercial oligarchy in Britain that had long ceased to practice the republican creed. Yet there is also irony in the fact that while Walpole's government persecuted radicals at home, it had little choice but to rely on them abroad.[185]

Jacob sees irony where none exists. There is no irony, although there may be hypocrisy. The Whigs promoted subversives on the continent whom they would have thrown in jail in England. Subversion became a deliberate foreign policy when the Whigs sent the radicals abroad to undermine the Bourbon monarchy, a fact which Jacob recognizes elsewhere, when she describes Rousset de Missy's career as promoter of Toland's pantheism and publisher (and probably author) of the *Traite de trois imposteurs*. Even in his sixties in exile, Rousset could still write effusively about pantheism to his friend Marchand.

By the 1730s Rousset de Missy's role in promoting subversion was clearer. In October 1737, Gaspard Fritsch, one of Rousset de Missy's former comrades, close to death and having second thoughts about leaving this life in the cold and unconsoling arms of the god of pantheism, revealed that Levier got the *Traite des trois imposteurs* from Rousset de Missy, and that he later combined it with *La Vie de Spinoza*, another subversive text Levier copied from the library of Benjamin Furly. In a letter full of remorse to Marchand, Fritsch named Rousset as the author of the infamous *Traite*.

The Whigs were subversive in other ways as well. When the authorized lodge was set up in England in 1735, the English forced the Dutch to accept Jews in the authorized lodge in Holland. Prayers at open lodge meetings were vetted for any Christian elements Jews might find offensive. Most Jews admitted to the lodge in England and Holland were Sephardim who had taken refuge in England and Holland after expulsion from Spain. New members had names like Mendez, De Medin, De Costa, and Avares. But Ashkenazic names also began appearing on the rolls of petitioners. By 1759 half of the petitioners were Jewish with Ashkenazic names like Jacub Moses, Lazars Levy, and Jacub Arons. Sometimes the Jews changed their names, making the number of Jewish initiates difficult to discern. When Menachem Mendl Herz Wolff was admitted to the Grand Lodge in London, he had changed his name to Emmanuel Harris.

Freemasonry accelerated the acceptance of Jews in England. Soon the lodge ceremonies, always based on Cabala, took a more explicitly Jewish character. Christ was referred to as "Master of the Lodge." Christianity, hopelessly divided among continually proliferating sects, was seen as best preserved in its doctrine form in Judaism.

More importantly, membership in the lodge was defined by acceptance of the "universal morality" embodied in the Noachide Law. In the 20 years following the founding of the Grand Lodge in 1717, the lodge had become more Jewish as philo-Catholic Jacobites were expelled or driven into "irregular" lodges on the Continent. This judaizing showed up in the 1738 revision of Anderson's *Constitutions*, according to which it is necessary that "all agree in the three great Articles of Noah, enough to preserve the Cement of the Lodge."[186] The fact that many lodge brothers in Holland were also merchants fostered development of what could be termed Jewish cosmopolitanism. This attitude would also fit in with Whig goals because it eliminated Scots loyal to the Pretender and his restoration to the throne. Masons felt that they belonged to a "universal" organization that transcended the narrow limits of creed and country. The fraternal bonding of the lodge undermined other ties, and in the place of loyalty to realities like blood and soil substituted the abstractions of the revolution—liberty, fraternity and equality, universal values applicable in any place or time. "Are we not members of the same family," the masons asked. "Is the universe not the country to the masonic [brotherhood]."[187]

Katz claims a new Jew emerged in the 1730s, one eager to join the lodge and willing to sacrifice adherence to the law and religious ritual to be admitted. The Jews were often offered pork during initiation dinners as a sign they adhered to the new "universal" religion. The Lodge thus fostered subversion of religious beliefs. Or, more likely, fostered subversion indirectly by promoting membership of people who were willing to lie to get ahead. The precedent had been established at Javne, where rabbinic Judaism took shape after 70 AD, and reaffirmed during the converso crisis in Spain. If it was permissible to lie and accept baptism under duress to avoid angry mobs in Spain, then it was permissible to lie by eating pork to gain access to the lodge. Between 1730 and 1750, "a new type of Jew was emerging, one who had acquired some Western education and had adjusted his behavior to conform to the standards accepted among gentiles, to the extent that he now could aspire to full membership in their society. This new Jew first made his appearance among the Sephardim of England, Holland, and France, and afterward among the Ashkenazim of Western countries."[188]

Membership in the lodge involved displacing traditional loyalties. The lodge thus contributed to the rise of modern ideology, where a confected creed like Marxism or Neoconservatism would replace traditional allegiances that bound Christians and Jews to traditional religions and their communities. Masonic lodges solved the problem of religious war by adopting the Jewish

idea of the Noachide Law as the basis for the lodge and civil society. When the Protestants rejected the Catholic faith, they rejected universal religion. The lodge became, as a result, an example of the return of the repressed. Instead of believing in the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church, the lodge member was initiated into "the religion in which all Men agree." After over two hundred years of sectarian strife, the Lodge picked up where the now abandoned Catholic Church left off, as "the Means of conciliating true friendship among Persons that must have remain'd at a perpetual Distance."[189] The means whereby the Englishman could transcend sectarian difference and the strife that went with it was the Noachide Law. As Anderson put it in his 1738 revision of the Constitutions:

> A mason is obliged by his Tenure to observe the Moral Law as a true Noachide. In ancient times the Christian masons were charged to comply with the Christian Usages of each Country where they travell'd or work'd. . . they are not only charged to adhere to that Religion in which all men agree. . . (leaving each Brother to his own particular Opinions) . . . For they all agree in the 3 great Articles of Noah, enough to preserve the Cement of the Lodge.[190]

The solution to religious division was moralism. The lodge member could hold whatever religious views he liked, but the law of Noah, which antedated Christianity and the law of Moses, was universal and binding on all. Katz claims the masons derived the idea from John Selden's *De jure natural et gentium juxta disciplinam Ebraeorum*, "which had described the seven Noachide Laws as part of the ancient Jewish legal heritage."[191] Selden, in turn, had derived them not from Christian tradition, which "had never known of any such concept as Noachide commandments,"[192] but from the Talmud. Masonry adopted the Talmudic idea of tolerance that the Jews were supposed to show toward *goyim* "considered deserving of respect."[193] This entailed selective vision because the Talmud was also full of suggestions on how the Jews were to treat *goyim* not deserving of respect, and these revelations had fueled Christian outrage during the Middle Ages. By the high noon of masonic influence in the mid-18th century, Christians were not seen as having a revelation superior to and superseding the revelation of the Jews. If anything freemasonry proved the opposite. The Jews had a superior revelation because it was prior to the Christian revelation and therefore pristine and uncorrupted. This logic finds clear expression in freemasonry's espousal of the Noachide principles:

> If a prior revelation had occurred in the time of Noah and this revelation was vouchsafed to all mankind, then all who acknowledged and obeyed the commandments given at the time would attain salvation. Christianity lacked a principle of this nature and so found difficulty in according any positive religious status to those beyond its pale. The introduction of this concept, culled from ancient Jewish jurisprudence, into European

thought by identifying it with the law of nature provided non-Jewish thinkers with an intellectual instrument which allowed them to justify toleration without abandoning their belief in divine revelation.[194]

attack this radical on Christian principles could not go unnoticed, even the members swore not to reveal the lodge's secrets. A mob attacked the meeting of the lodge in the Hague in 1735, the year the Dutch authorities shut down, indicating a reaction was setting in. Not long after a lodge was formed in Rome, word of its existence, its popularity, and its subversive judaizing principles soon reached Pope Clement XII, who issued a bull condemning it in 1738. The Catholic condemnation of freemasonry would remain constant and consistent for the next two and half centuries. Benedict XIV reiterated Clement's condemnation, as did Pope Leo XIII in the encyclical *Humanum Genus* on April 20, 1884. One hundred years later, Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, who would become Pope Benedict XVI, reminded Catholics the caveats the popes had ascribed to freemasonry were still in force.

The popes saw the masonic lodges as hotbeds of republicanism and revolution. They proposed a coherent critique of masonic notions of freedom based on a theory of the passions applicable to individual souls and sovereign states. Aware of how revolutionaries appropriated the masonic concept of liberty and used it to justify the crimes of the French Revolution, Leo XIII said "by liberty. . . we mean [being] free from slavery to Satan or to our passions, both of them most wicked masters." Freedom, as defined by the masons, was indistinguishable from license; it allowed human lusts and passions to spin out of control, which led inevitably to civil strife and revolution:

> For, the fear of God and reverence for divine laws being taken away, the authority of rulers despised, sedition permitted and approved and the popular passions urged on to lawlessness, with no restraint save that of punishment, a change and overthrow of all things will necessarily follow. Yea, this change and overthrow is deliberately planned and put forward by many associations of Communists and socialists, and to their undertakings the sect of Freemasons is not hostile, but generally favors their designs and holds in common with them their chief opinions.[195]

Once the revolutionaries overturned the Catholic social order, they used the freedom that was indistinguishable from license to maintain their power:

> For since generally no one is accustomed to obey crafty and clever men so submissively as those whose soul is weakened and broken down by the domination of the passions, there have been in the sect of the Freemasons some who have plainly determined and proposed that, artfully and of set purpose, the multitude should be satiated with a boundless license of vice, as, when this had been done, it would easily come under their power and authority for any acts of daring.[196]

Considering that it was written in 1884, *Humanum Genus* was a remarkably prescient prediction of how sexual liberation would be used as a form of political control in masonic countries like the United States during the 20th century. The popes traced freemasonry to "the ingenuity of the English nation,"[197] born out of revolutionary experiences of the 1640s and 1688. Jacob concedes the accusation "did contain a simple truth,"[198] namely that freemasonry was a British invention, but calls the idea that freemasonry was linked to the English revolutions of the 17th century a "myth."[199] There were certainly some myths associated with that tradition: in France Cromwell was consistently referred to as a freemason throughout the 18th century. But during the 1730s, popes were not the only ones who saw Whig Freemasonry as subversive and revolutionary.

In 1737, a year before the pope condemned masons, the Tories attacked them as sodomites and subversives, claiming, "no government ought to suffer such dark and clandestine Assemblies" because they may plot against the state and because they admit "Turks, Jews, Infidels, Papists, and Nonjurers." Other accounts elaborated on the charges, adding drunkenness and sodomy to the most frequently repeated charges. In addition, the lodges were seen as places where government positions might be secured. Given the large number of court Whigs in the lodges of the 1730s, the insight held substance.[200]

In the wake of the papal condemnation of 1738, police in Paris conducted raids on the lodges there. During the 1740s, masons were under attack as English agents who wanted to subvert both state and church. The author of the pamphlet *Les Francs-Macons ecrases* (1747) claimed freemasonry was an English and republican conspiracy based on the subversive principles of liberty and equality. The charges troubled Rousset de Missy, who may have been involved in the masonic rebuttal, which claimed the lodge was beneficial to society and authorized by nature itself. In the lodge, "everything changes, all things in the universe are renewed and reformed, order is established, the rule and measure of things is understood, duty is followed, reason listened to, wisdom comprehended and mortals, without changing their essence, appear as new men."[201]

As part of their counterattack in response to the papal condemnation, the publishing circle around Marchand, Levier, and Rousset brought out an atheistic tract by Anthony Collins, *Le Philosophe*. Collins' tract broke new ground, claiming "the existence of God [is] the most widespread and deeply engrained of all the prejudices."[202] In its place the enlightened man, the philosophe, puts civil society, "[as] the only divinity that he will recognize on earth."[203] Soon the word "philosophe" was circulating in France. The philosophe espoused English ideas, and as a result of the translation when those ideas crossed the English channel, Newtonian physics and freemasonry were conflated with the revolutionary enthusiasm of 1640 which was their antithesis. The link between Cromwell and freemasonry was probably

ported by Radical Whigs like Toland and Collins, who had roots back to the Commonwealth period. By not denying these connections, Toland and Collins and their Huguenot promoters handed a public relations victory to their opponents, who portrayed Freemasons as dangerous communists and revolutionaries, based on the increasingly radical writings of Whig agents like Collins. In Brussels an anonymous pamphlet appeared in French accusing the masons of wanting to create "a universal and democratic republic, which would also hold in common all of the earth's wealth."[204] Anti-masonic pamphlets in Amsterdam linked the masons with Oliver Cromwell, and Dutch masons were accused of promoting English revolutionary and republican ideas. Freemasons were "the Cromwellist Society," preparing to bring English revolution to Dutch soil.

When Dutch troops were unable to prevent a small scale French invasion in April 1747, rioting broke out in Dutch cities to protest the ruling oligarchy's impotence and to demand Stadholder William IV be brought back to power. In the Hague, buildings were festooned with orange banners. Mobs of rioting sailors got their ships to fire cannon in support. The spark which set off the Dutch Revolution of 1747 was the invasion of the French, but the tinder ignited by that spark had been prepared by people like Rousset de Missy through establishment of pro-Orangist masonic lodges which were instruments of Whig foreign policy. English agents in Holland exploited the unrest caused by the French invasion to deplore the impotence of the oligarchs and to urge a restoration of the House of Orange. Foremost among those English agents were William and Charles Bentinck, sons of the advisor to William III and, as a result of being raised in England, Dutchmen who considered themselves Whigs. Together with Rousset, the Bentincks worked for the restoration of William IV as Stadholder, and the reinstitution of Whig Orangism as the best alternative to the "corrupt and self-serving rule of oligarchy."[205] Bentinck and Rousset de Missy found in Locke a justification for representative government and revolution. Two centuries later the United States government was promoting the same thing in the Ukraine, even using the color Orange to symbolize its Lockean revolution.

The Dutch Revolution succeeded initially beyond the wildest dreams of its proponents. When the rioting in the Hague in April spread to Amsterdam in May, the States proclaimed William IV Stadholder, and he appointed Rousset de Missy as his historian. Rousset then promoted the position of the radical Doelistenbeweging, which went well beyond what Whigs were advocating in England, promoting a revolutionary democratic regime. It is difficult to tell if Rousset was an Orangist agent out of control or if the goal of Whig foreign policy was radically different from what they were willing to allow for domestic consumption. The Whigs had tried to spread the Glorious Revolution to foreign soil, but the minute it got transplanted, it threatened, like an invasive species introduced into an environment with no natural

predators, to spin out of control into a genuinely democratic if not communist revolution, like the ones that had taken place in Muenster and would take place in France and Russia. When England refused to send troops to support its Whig agents, the revolution sputtered out and died. In June 1749 Rousset was arrested, fined 1000 guilders, and banished from The Hague, a city which he would look upon for the rest of his life as "paradise lost."

If the Whigs, who let their Dutch allies twist in the wind, had been paying close attention to the trajectory of the Dutch Revolution, they would have realized that black operations invariably spiral out of control. This was not only true of the "irregular warfare" popularized by T. E. Lawrence after World War I, it was true of psychological warfare as well. In both, "the heaviest handicap of all, and the most lasting one, was of a moral kind."[206] The black operation known as the Enlightenment taught the younger generation "to defy authority and break the rules of civic morality."[207] Rousset de Missy's use of Locke as a revolutionary battering ram made "a virtue of defying authority and violating rules." When the English promoted guerrilla warfare in Spain in response to Napoleon's invasion, they created an "epidemic of armed revolutions"[208] culminating in the Spanish Civil War of 1937.

LIBERTY AND EQUALITY, FREEMASONS IN AMERICA

The Dutch Revolution of 1747 was a dress rehearsal for the French Revolution of 1789. Both began with unplanned incidents that might have remained insignificant, but for the fact that the masonic lodges were in a position to exploit them. In both instances, the unintended consequences of Whig Masonic political machinations far outweighed the expected benefits. The net result of English meddling in Dutch politics was the Diplomatic Revolution of 1756, when Austria pulled out of the northern alliance and signed a treaty with France.

In 1754 the war between England and France over control of North America was not going well for France. Many feared the French would invade Holland, and, in the Duke of Newcastle's words to William Bentinck, "take possession of the Low Countries, as a sort of deposit, till we had done them justice in North America."[209] Since Rousset de Missy was in regular correspondence with Bentinck, the Duke of Newcastle's words probably caused his concern. To help the English cause, Rousset brought out a French edition of Locke's *Two Treatises of Civil Government* (written in 1690 in the wake of the Glorious Revolution), hoping it would spread revolution in France as in Holland seven years earlier.

Rousset disguised his identity as Locke's publisher by using the cryptic initials, L.C.R.D.M.A.D.P, which only the initiated understood to mean "Le Chevalier Rousset de Missy, Academie du Plessis." The French translation radicalized Locke's words. Where Locke used "commonwealth" and

commonwealth," in French they became "*republique.*" The idea of a republic would have been anathema to Whigs in England, if Rousset were talking about England. He was referring to France, however, which meant the intent behind the translation was more destructive than instructive.

Rousset de Missy's translation of Locke was the most widely reprinted edition of Locke in Europe until the French Revolution. One French intellectual who read it was Jean-Jacques Rousseau. Rousseau was in the circle that met at Charles Bentinck's estate at Nyenhuis, a center for philosophic discussion as well as scientific experimentation. Hume and Diderot dined at Nyenhuis, and Rousseau became godfather to one of William Bentinck's grandchildren. Rousset would have most certainly been part of this salon and could have met Rousseau there if he hadn't been condemned to exile. Bentinck introduced worthy writers to a new generation of publishers and made sure their books were discussed in Holland's lodges, where they learned freemasonry restored man to the natural state praised by Rousseau. Prominent among the new generation of radical publishers was Marc-Michel Rey, who became Rousseau's publisher in the 1760s. He also published the works of the Baron d'Holbach and Diderot's *Encyclopedie.* By the late 1760s, Rey had published all the major philosophes. His symbolic link to the radical publishers of the previous generation associated with the Knights of Jubilation became clear when he published Rousset de Missy's *Traite de trois imposteurs* after d'Holbach brought that classic of the subversive genre to his attention. Rey's role as a crucial link between English radicalism and the Enlightenment in France became even clearer when he published d'Holbach's *Systeme de la Nature* in 1770. D'Holbach got the idea for that book after translating Toland's *Letters to Serena* into French; whole sections of those translations of radical English ideas found their way into his book.

Rousseau differed dramatically from Voltaire, especially in his economic views. But both men were useful to the Whigs, whose agents in Holland made sure their ideas reached a wide audience in the French-speaking world. Rousseau was useful because he posited a "natural" alternative to "artificial civilization," soon to become synonymous with the court at Versailles. Unlike the pope when he talked about the relationship between passion and revolution in his condemnation of freemasonry, Rousseau attributed all human evil to social injustice perpetrated by an ossified artificial ruling class that lobbied for nothing but its own privileges. "Man is born free, and yet we see him everywhere in chains." Rousseau's *Social Contract* was the French radicalization of Locke's treatise on government. The inspired prophet from Geneva, even though he had converted to Catholicism from the Calvinism of his youth, fulminated against a corrupt priesthood that had no basis in nature."

Abbe Augustin Barruel, author of one of the first histories of the French Revolution, would continue the classical moral critique of freemasonry

and the revolution it engendered that Clement XII had begun in 1738. The "philosophic" meditation on "liberty" and "equality" which began with Montesquieu's *Spirit of Laws* was taken to a new level when Rousseau wrote the *Social Contract* and construed "liberty" and "equality" as "supreme happiness." "If we examine," Barruel writes synthesizing Rousseau's ideas, "in what the supreme happiness of All consists, which ought to be the grand object of every legislature, it will appear to center in these two points Liberty and Equality. In Liberty, because all private dependence is so much strength subtracted from the body of the state, in Equality, because Liberty cannot subsist without it."[210] Rousseau was only "seeking to realize Montesquieu's principle; to give to each man who feels himself a free agent the means of being his own governor, and of living under no other laws than those which he had himself made."[211]

Rousseau and Montesquieu's ideas received their first application in America. By 1760, the Whigs had lost control of masonic lodges in America. The American lodges were Scottish and "antient," and many of the masons there had contempt for the revisionist history that suffused Anderson's Constitutions. The split in the lodges facilitated a split between England, whose foreign policy was in the hands of Whig ideologues, and the American colonies, which deeply resented the economic exploitation those policies entailed. The conflict with America was exacerbated by the double game at the heart of Whig Freemasonry. Jacob again notices it, but can't articulate the strategy fully, when she claims "on the continent" Whig Freemasonry promoted "a series of revolutions in which masonic rhetoric and idealism, with its British and utopian associations, may have at moments made seem more plausible. In the country of their origin, however, most masonic orators encouraged order and stability. . . . Indeed the lodges were an important vehicle for inculcating loyalism to king and government."[212]

There is no dichotomy. The radical version of Whig Freemasonry was not intended for domestic consumption. This simple fact also explains one of the big issues in masonic studies, namely, the myth of the two lodges, a myth fostered by Barruel in his history of the French Revolution—a book written under Whig auspices in England.

The lodges in America were anomalous. They were not English, in the sense of being in England, but they weren't foreign either. The lodges in America were founded long before the founding of the Grand Lodge in London in 1717. Their residual loyalty to a more "antient" tradition fostered resentment against the Whig parvenus. That loyalty combined with resentment against exploitative Whig economic policies to ensure the lodge in America would favor revolution unacceptable to Whig oligarchs in England. One source claims the lodge in Boston suspended its regular meeting so members could take part in the Boston Tea Party. If freemasonry suffered "a cultural

...formation when it crossed the channel,"[213] it suffered another when it ...ed the ocean.

...here were other factors at work in the American Revolution. Puritanism ...ver die a sudden violent death in America, as in England in 1660, ...English mobs, full of hatred for the failed Commonwealth, dug up ...well's corpse and hanged it. Puritanism was left to expire of its own self-...dictions in America during the course of the 18th century. As a result ...Enlightenment grew up there side by side with American Puritanism. ...min Franklin was 22 years old when Cotton Mather died. Both walked ...reets of Boston in the 1720s when, in England, the rout of Enthusiasm ...its replacement by freemasonry was all but complete. American ...ellectual life was always a peculiar combination of religious enthusiasm and ...anic politics; Newtonian freemasonry was the antithesis of Enthusiasm ...England and, *a fortiori*, on the continent, but Thomas Paine combined ...e two contradictory ideas, and his pamphlet *Common Sense* became one ...the seminal documents of the American republic.

The American mind thus was formed by the confluence of contradictory ...ms of judaizing, *i.e.,* Puritanism and freemasonry. American political ...ught would oscillate between these two poles for the next two centuries. ...e revolutionary creed hatched in America found immediate acceptance in ...ce, largely because of Benjamin Franklin, "the representative figure who ...bodied the new democratic ideal of a humanity liberated from the restraints ...privilege and tradition and recognizing no laws but those of nature and ...son,"[214] but Franklin was not operating in a vacuum. Rousseau, whose ...ks on the social contract and the noble savage seemed to have America in ...d prepared his way. Franklin was also a mason, representing the Scottish ...ction regnant in America, and his way had been prepared there too by the ...ssais lodges founded by the Jacobite exiles in the wake of their defeat by ...iam of Orange in 1690.

In America, it looked as if Bacon's dream of a New Atlantis had finally ...e true. A government had come into existence that was totally congruent ...h the laws of nature as formed by the Great Architect of the Universe, or as ...e put it, "The revolution of America presented in politics what was only ...ry in mechanics. But such is the irresistible nature of Truth that all it asks ...d all it wants is the liberty of appearing. The sun needs no inscription to ...inguish him from darkness, and no sooner did the American governments ...ow themselves to the world than despotism felt a shock and man began ...contemplate redress."[215]

In 1787, eleven years after the American Declaration of Independence, ...shock was felt in the Austrian Netherlands the Protestant revolution had ...ed to wrest from the Hapsburgs in the 16th century. This should have been ...exactly what the English wanted except the revolution spread to Holland ...where the English ally the Stadholder William V was on the throne.

According to Whig political theory, not unlike the Breshnev Doctrine articulated by the Soviets two centuries later, there were good revolutions and bad revolutions, and, according to this calculus, the Dutch Revolution of 1787 was a bad revolution. Prussia, England's ally, invaded Holland and crushed it. William V continued in power, prompting one cynical Dutch patriot to claim "The English endeavor to enslave everyone and keep themselves free."[216]

Since the Dutch revolution happened two years before the French, some historians have imagined the former as a "rehearsal" for the latter. The major difference was the absence of the Prussian army in France in 1791. This absence in 1791, like the presence in 1787, is consistent with the objectives of English foreign policy, which promoted revolution in Catholic countries but suppressed it at home and in countries ruled by Protestant allies.

Jacob ridicules the idea that freemasonry or its child, the Enlightenment, caused the French Revolution. Yet a close reading of her book provides evidence that supports just that conclusion. There were most certainly Frenchmen who connected the lodge with the revolution. Some were masons. "A provincial lodge," she writes, "writing to the Paris Grand Lodge almost offhandedly remarked that 'in the civil order the deputies of a province represent the general assemblies of the nation; it is the same in the lodges.'"[217] Jacob sees "a remarkable parallelism"[218] between the National Assembly and the republican and democratic principles Frenchmen learned in the Lodge, but she stops short of endorsing a connection because she associates the link with Barruel, whom she terms "the most famous—and paranoid—historian of 18th century freemasonry."[219] Barruel named freemasonry as "one of the great causes of the French Revolution."[220] He was not paranoid. Indeed, he could have made a much more effective case if he hadn't become caught up in the tangled web of Whig politics.

FREEMASONRY AND THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

Christopher Dawson does not share Jacob's reticence in linking freemasonry to the Revolution. If Revolution became "a real religion,"[221] as Dawson claims, it was most certainly not a religion without a Church. The Religion of Revolution possessed "a definite though simple body of dogmas which aspired to take the place of Christianity as the creed of the new age," and it also "possessed its ecclesiastical hierarchy and organization in the Order of Freemasons, which attained the climax of its development in the two decades that preceded the Revolution."[222] Inspired by Benjamin Franklin and the Lodge of Nine Sisters, freemasonry was instrumental in founding numerous societies or clubs, which provided the practical and theoretical basis for the Revolution. In those clubs, as in the lodge, social standing counted for little next to the overriding principles of fraternity and equality. Once the *ancien regime* showed itself incapable of commanding its armies and running its government, club

members quickly stepped forward and applied the principles they learned in the lodge to the governance of the state. If freemasonry was the link in the revolutionary chain that connected Protestantism to Socialism, the French Jacobins were the link between the lodge and the revolutionary government after the fall of the *ancien regime*. It was "in the clubs and the popular societies that the Revolution found its real organs."[223] The clubs were "the churches of a new religion."[224] The clubs abolished the lodges and simultaneously raised them to a higher level, just as the Revolution was to do on a much wider and larger scale.

Philippe, the Duke of Orleans, later known as Philippe Égalité, played a crucial role in the move from Lodge to Revolution. Dawson claims Philippe, the leading figure of French freemasonry, "was the center of a web of subterranean agitation and intrigue which has never been unraveled."[225] The historian could start by examining the nexus of revolutionary clubs, cafés, brothels, and publishing ventures known as the Palais Royale. Philippe Égalité created the matrix from which the French Revolution sprang when he built the Palais Royale. The Palais, where "reform moved through revolt to revolution," began as the Duke of Orleans' attempt to create "a sort of Hyde Park in the French Capital," where French Whigs could debate the "mild Whiggish reformism of the London coffee houses that the House of Orleans had originally sought to imitate."[226]

Furet claims the original vision of the French radicals involved creating "an English style political class" in France in which the "liberal nobility could collaborate with the Enlightened bourgeoisie."[227] When the *ancien regime* collapsed precipitously, the French radicals had the task of becoming English overnight, a project doomed to failure. Failed or not, the French got the idea of the "circle" as the small revolutionary cell was called, from the English. Billington quotes Mercier, who explained that even before the Revolution, "the taste for circles, unknown to our fathers and copied from the English, had become naturalized."[228]

The Palais Royale was supposed to imitate the English coffee house where Whigs discussed politics. The French radicals, lacking the moral restraint that characterized the bourgeoisie in England and America, turned the Palais Royale into a center of low pleasure instead, specializing in political pornography, and bringing out classics like *The National Bordello under the Patronship of the Queen*. The Duke of Orleans hired as his personal secretary Choderlos de Laclos, author of *Les Liaisons Dangereuses* and a pioneer, along with his friend the Marquis de Sade, of "the liberated pornography that flourished during the revolutionary era."[229]

The Palais Royale became notorious for its prostitutes, the most notorious being Madame de Genlis (later Citoyenne Brulart), the Duc d'Orleans' mistress. The prostitutes who gathered in the gardens of Palais Royale by night made sure "every form of sexual gratification" described in the

pornography produced there was "available in the cafes and apartments of the Palais complex," including the possibility of sex with a seven-foot-two-inch Prussian prostitute, Mlle. Lapierre.[230] Providing "the intoxicating ambiance of an earthly utopia,"[231] the cafes also incited those who frequented them to act on the "politics of desire," and bring down the government that inhibited their pleasures and political fantasies. If "distinctions of rank were obliterated" in these cafes, and "men were free to exercise sexual as well as political freedom," then "The Temple of Voluptuousness" was destined to become the birthplace of revolution.[232]

This is what the classical tradition from Plato to Barruel said would happen when passion got out of control, but it came as a shock and bitter disappointment to the Newtonian Whigs who had promoted it. They thought they could control revolutionary passion in the same way that Ben Franklin had learned to harness lightning in Leyden jars. At the Palais Royale, the French radicals, clouded by sexual passion and the pleasures of drugs and alcohol, mistook fantasy for reality, and soon "the ideal of total secular happiness" began to "seem credible as well as desirable."[233]

The French Revolution began at the Palais Royale at around 3:30 PM on July 12, 1789 when Camille Desmoulins, outraged at the dismissal of finance minister Necker, jumped on a table and shouted, *"Aux Armes!"* The Palais Royale—or to be more precise, the Cafe Foy—became the "portico of the Revolution,"[234] the gate from which it issued forth. By 4:00 the mob was coursing through the streets of Paris carrying busts of Necker and the patron of their vices, the Duc d'Orleans. At 8:00 PM royal troops opened fire on the mob, killing a number of people. The mob had little to go on by way of historical precedent. The Protestant revolutions of Huss and Muentzer were so far in the distant past that they could provide little guidance. The socialist revolutions of 1830, 1848, 1870, and 1917 were hidden unborn in the womb of the future. So the French revolutionaries "echoed the Anglophilia of the Duke of Orleans in hailing the events in France as '*cette glorieuse Revolution.*'"[235] Their intentions may have been clear, but in carrying them out in a different culture and time, Anglophile intentions gave way to a Revolution with a terrible logic of its own.

On July 14, the mob broke into the Hotel des Invalides, where it liberated 32,000 muskets in the name of the French people. The mob then headed for the Bastille, where the Marquis de Sade had been haranguing them from his cell through a funnel that served as his urinal. The mob was looking for arms so its members could return fire the next time they were attacked. Faced with the cannon the mob had looted from the Hotel des Invalides, the guards at the Bastille surrendered in mid-afternoon, whereupon they were savagely murdered, and their heads, stuck on the end of pikes, were paraded through the city. By the end of the day, Louis XVI was no longer king, or was king in name only. Three days later, he went to Paris and acknowledged Bailly and

...ierre as the nation's new revolutionary rulers. It turned out Louis XIV ...ght when he said, "*L'etat c'est moi.*" Once his grandson abdicated, the ...e collapsed around him, and the rioting spread, filling the vacuum his ...ration created. Having rehearsed the revolution during the food riots of ...winter of 1788-9, the peasants armed themselves and attacked the local ...aux and abbeys and burned the administration's deeds and records, as if, ...doing, they could obliterate the hold the past had on them.

...the uprising which began on July 12 was spontaneous in the same sense in ...ich combustion is sometimes called spontaneous: the fire broke out at the ...ais Royale because Philippe Égalité had assembled so much combustible ...erial in one place that it had become an inevitability. Billington gives ...ee reasons why the Revolution broke out there:

> ...offered, first of all, a privileged sanctuary for intellectuals where they ...ould turn from speculation to organization. Second, its owner and ...atron, the Duke of Orleans, represented the point through which new ...deas broke into the power elite of the old regime. . . . finally the Palais ...provided a living link with the underworld of Paris and with the new ...ocial forces that had to be mobilized for any revolutionary victory.[236]

...sta Webster, in a book that is controversial, offers another reason, "The ...ld of Pitt,"[237] as part of a narrative in which she struggles with English ...ponsibility for the revolution in France. The facts are clear: Montmorin ...d Gouverneur Morris that he "had indisputable evidence of the intrigues ...Britain and Prussia that they gave money to the Prince de Conde and ...Duc d'Orleans."[238] Marie Antoinette told Madame Campan not to go to ...s because "the English have been distributing money there!"[239] Webster ...o cites Benzenval, who in "describing the riots of July 1789, speaks of the ...ands employed by the Duc d'Orleans and by England."[240]

English guineas were found on the rioters, and Englishmen were seen ...ing with the mobs during the first days of the revolution. Seditious ...phlets were printed in London, and there had been a heavy traffic in ...ney, messages, and letters between England and the revolutionary leaders ...France. Many of those same leaders "were constantly in England both ...re and during the Revolution; Marat lived for years in Soho, whilst ...non, Brissot, Petion, St. Hururge, Theroigne de Mericourt and the ruffian ...ndo were all habitués of London. These facts admit of no denial."[241]

England, according to Webster, needed to be worried, because Louis XVI ...s "an enthusiast for the navy,"[242] and by opening the port of Cherbourg, ...ened England's domination of the seas. English diplomats heaved ...most audible sigh of relief when the revolution broke out in Paris. In ...ember 1789, Lord Dorset wrote from Paris that the chaos from the ...ution meant it would be a long time "before France returns to any state ...istence which can make her a subject of uneasiness to other nations."[243]

Sorel felt England was in position "to substitute herself for France" and profit from France's misfortunes "in every market" as well as "in every chancellery" where the two nations did business.'[244] Pitt, according to Sorel, "would have been careful not to obstruct the development of a revolution so advantageous to his designs. He also held that a king of France deprived of his prestige, with his rights limited and his power contested, would marvelously answer the convenience of England. But he was not one of those greedy politicians blinded by jealousy, whose covetousness leads them to take a brutal advantage of fortune."[245]

After stating her case, Webster changes horses and declares that it is "illogical and absurd" to assume the English Government "took advantage of the disturbed state of the country to wreak her vengeance on the French government by encouraging and actually financing sedition."[246] George III opposed the revolution at every turn, and Pitt, his minister, "could have had no conceivable object in furthering a movement that shook all the thrones of Europe."[247] Pitt and the Jacobins were like oil and water; they were incapable of collaborating on anything. The Jacobins were "the natural enemies of England,"[248] and they were just as indignant at the thought of Pitt supporting the revolution as Webster herself. Why, she wonders, "should *'l'or de Pitt'* be mentioned by Jacobin writers with the same indignation as by Royalists?"[249] The answer is simple. The Jacobins knew the English were using that money to subvert French power.

But what about the Duc d'Orleans' anglophilia and his frequent trips to England? "This apparent love of the Duc d'Orleans for the English was in the end the cause of all the calumnies against England with which the leaders of the different factions influenced public credulity, so as to throw on the policy of that nation the excesses of which they alone were guilty." The guineas found on the English and French revolutionaries came from the Duc d'Orleans; "with diabolical cunning he drew out in English coin, and had sent over to France in order to throw suspicion on the English."[250]

In the final analysis, Webster can only exonerate Pitt by implicating the Whig radicals associated with Dr. Price and the Prince of Wales in the conspiracy she dismissed as absurd and far-fetched:

> In this case English gold did play a part in the revolutionary movement, but it was provided not by the Government, but by its opponents. The Opposition party in London formed an exact counterpart to the duke's party in Paris; headed by the Prince of Wales, the *roues* of Carlton House formed a Fronde against George III, such as the *roues* of the Palais Royale formed against Louis XVI.[251]

Webster claims further:

> it was the 'democratic' party, the revolutionaries of France and Whigs of England, who supported the follies and extravagances of these

dissolute princes, whilst in both countries the cause of order and morality was represented by the sovereign whom the democrats wished to dethrone."[252]

XVI knew of his cousin Philippe's connection with the Whig radicals; is why he exiled him to Vilier-Coterets, not to a foreign country, and most mainly not to England. In London, Philippe consorted with radical Whig ans and Jewish lodge members like Samuel de Falk, as well as Whig als like Lord Stanhope, Price, Priestly and the "drunkard" Thomas . The Whigs were "the natural allies of their country's bitterest enemies, Jacobins of France," and they not only abetted the revolution abroad, but e "seeking to create a kindred movement at home."[253]

The mystery surrounding Pitt's gold resolves itself once we remove the prime ister's name. Call it Walpole's gold instead, and the Whig involvement in version in France is too obvious to deny. Although many Englishmen, luding Whigs like Edmund Burke, opposed the French Revolution, that olution got started as a Whig black operation, and, like all black operations, attack on France got out of control. Just one year into the revolution, of steam engine inventor James Watt's Dutch friends wrote to him about progress of the revolution. "The French," he wrote, "have now outrun instructors the English."[254] The Dutch republicans thus saw the French olution as the application of "English principles"[255] by students who went ond their teachers' intent.

The revolution would destroy the very thing that prepared its way, namely, masonic lodges, when it declared all private institutions and associations al. French allegiance to the revolution would become widespread when urch property was looted and distributed though the *assignats* to a much ler group than the looting of England's churches had enriched in the 16th tury. The revolution then took on a life of its own, and many came to ve the masonic lodges were no longer necessary. The masonic lodge was y necessary "in a despotic society."[256] No one epitomized this transition ter than the Duc d'Orleans, who had been the leading figure in French masonry and in constant contact with the lodge in London before 1789. even journeyed to London in 1789, a trip that caused him problems later.

On September 15, 1792, France became a republic, and to celebrate the nge (or to ingratiate himself with the winners) Philippe presented himself the new government and asked to change his name to "Égalité." He also ed that the Palais-Royale, his revolutionary pleasure dome, be renamed "garden of equality." Philippe was elected to the National Convention, many in that body, including Jean Paul Marat, questioned his loyalty sincerity, alleging he "speculated on the revolution as on his jockeys"[257] simply acted in a way "most convenient to his interests."[258] The crux of issue was Philippe's connection to the masons and England. The Jacobins

suspected him of being a British agent working to establish a Whig-inspired constitutional monarchy in France.

The Palais was still politically significant in 1792. The Girondists, headquartered at the Cafe du Caveau at the Palais, organized the demonstrations of August 10, 1792 that overthrew the monarchy and led to the creation of the First Republic. Conflict soon arose with the Jacobins, who considered the Girondins as Royalists because of their association with the Palais and the renamed Duc d'Orleans. "The Jacobins feared not only the royalists [like Philippe d'Orleans] who controlled the cafes within the Palais, but also the foreign friends of the Revolution who enjoyed the hospitality of the Palais-Royal."[259]

The legend that Cromwell was a freemason came to fruition on January 21, 1793 when the National Assembly executed Louis XVI. It is doubtful the convention could have taken this step without the model of the English regicide before their eyes. If the civilized English could murder their king, could not the French do likewise? Importing the lodge had already induced them to follow English models in other areas—from Newtonian physics to coffee houses. The example of Charles I haunted the trial of Louis XVI. Charles had run legal circles around his accusers, and the convention didn't want a repetition of that embarrassment at the French king's trial.

One day before the execution of the king, on January 20, 1793, a revolutionary leader was assassinated at the Palais Royale, and Philippe was considered a suspect. Jacobin mobs periodically launched assaults on the Palais as a suspected hotbed of royalism in the months following the murder. When Philippe's son defected to the counter-revolution in the spring, Philippe was arrested. Over the summer, the Jacobins slowly shut down the Palais' operations, and Philippe Égalité prepared his legal defense, knowing his life hung in the balance. The crucial issue was Philippe's involvement in freemasonry, because freemasonry was considered an instrument of English culture, if not foreign policy, and England and France were now at war. The Revolution had taken on a life of its own, far beyond what the English Whigs intended.

Facing the guillotine for treason, Philippe Égalité wrote a short manuscript, "*Voici mon histoire maconnique*," to explain his involvement with freemasonry. "At a time when no one could have foreseen our revolution, I attached myself to freemasonry, which offered a kind of image of equality, just as I attached myself to the parliaments, which offered a kind of image of liberty. I have since given up the phantom for the reality."[260] At least one historian finds it astounding that Philippe "had been attacked not by antirevolutionaries but by the Revolution's supporters for having been a freemason,"[261] but the attack is unsurprising because freemasonry was associated in the popular as well as the revolutionary mind with England. Philippe was a suspect because he was a freemason; the revolutionary organization that created the conditions

revolution was an object of suspicion to the leaders of the Revolution, because of its association with England, which declared war on France . By 1793 freemasonry was suspect to the French left and the French because every Frenchman, most especially the French masons, knew were participating in a system of governance inherited from another dimly remembered,"[262] namely, the Glorious Revolution. The knew "the version of civil polity they created in their private sociability lodge] had first taken shape in revolutionary England. In that belief, can now understand it, they were more right then even they could have ."[263]

Jacobins thought Philippe was conspiring with the English because of to London in 1789. Philippe was seen as part of the royalists' "Anglophile " to move France closer to a constitutional monarchy like that land after the Glorious Revolution. The replacement of the House of with a philo-Protestant constitutional monarch had been the goal of foreign policy for almost a century. On the verge of achieving their goal, English watched victory slip from their grasp as the revolution spun out control. The terror lasted until March 1794, when Robespierre succumbed own killing machine. Philippe Égalité was guillotined on November 6, along with Marie-Antoinette and 200 other enemies of the Revolution.

Once the Revolution occurred in France, freemasonry was in a bind own making, caught between Jewish cosmopolitanism, which the Lodge insisted on promoting on the continent, and the rising tide nationalism, which revolution engendered in France. Amsterdam was in the middle both geographically and ideologically. The Amsterdam had always admitted Jews. After the revolution in France emancipated Jews there, the number of Jewish applicants to La Bien Aimée increased matically. The Dutch had mixed feelings about Jewish emancipation and bership in the lodge. La Bien Aimée agreed to admit "nine gentlemen of Jewish Nation and Religion. . . [under the] stipulation that none of these tlemen of the Jewish nation and Religion. . . now or consequently will be able or permitted to be nominated, elected and even less appointed administration of the lodge."[264] Like Cromwell earlier and Napoleon the Dutch Freemasons feared that the Jews, once admitted, would take the lodge. German lodges expressed the same misgivings, but they were ently opposed by the Grand Lodge in London.

La Bien Aimée became revolutionized and French in January 1795 when French Army invaded Holland and routed the Prussians, who had been ding the Stadholder and Whig placeman William V. The forces Rousset had mobilized in 1747 finally turned on their English masters and ed a new Batavian Republic along French, not English, lines. Like Égalité, the Dutch Masons gave up the appearance in favor of reality. the sun of revolution rose over Holland, the candle of freemasonry,

which had lit the way during the dark years of the *ancien regime*, was no longer necessary.

In January 1795, La Bien Aimée opened a lodge meeting by adopting the revolutionary principles of liberty, fraternity, and equality. "Before opening the lodge our beloved chairman congratulated the assembled fraternity on the long-hoped-for revolution in our dear country, because of which liberty, fraternity and equality had now become the motto of our days, and furthermore announced to the brothers that from now on all honorary titles were held to be abolished among us."[265] When the brothers sang their masonic songs, "La Marseillaise" was first on the list. The lodge, however, had become unnecessary because it had become the model of a new world, the modern world, which had adopted and would go on to implement its principles in its struggle against what was left of the Catholic order in Europe. That masonic crusade would continue as the nationalist freemasonry of the *risorgimento* conquered the papal states in Italy, and when the masonic powers of America and England would dismember Austria, the last bastion of the Hapsburg's Catholic empire, following World War I. Both Wilson and Mazarek, the first president of Czechoslovakia, the country Wilson carved out of the heart of the Austro-Hungarian empire, were masons. In each case, "what began on the Continent as constitutionally governed societies for gentlemen" became "a microcosm of a new secular and civic, yet quasi-religious, political order we have now come to know simply as the modern world."[266]

ABBÉ AUGUSTIN BARRUEL

On August 10, 1792, fearing the increasing violence of the French mob against the clergy, Abbe Augustin Barruel closed the *Journal ecclesiastique*, from whose pages he had attacked the philosophes and then the revolutionaries. Sensing greater violence was in the offing, Abbe Barruel then disappeared. After going into hiding, he made his way to Normandy, and from there he escaped to asylum in England.

Barruel, whose family emigrated in the 13th century to France from Scotland, where they were known as Barwell, entered the Jesuits at 15, eight years before Louis XV banished them from France and 17 years before Pope Clement XIV suppressed the order in the bull *Dominus ac Redemptor.*

A priest without an order, Barruel set off for Poland after hearing the Jesuit confessor to Queen Marie Lecsinska was offering positions to expelled Jesuits from the west. When Barruel arrived in Prague, the provincial of the Jesuits in Bohemia, "charmed by his virtue and talents,"[267] persuaded him to stay. He then became tutor to a noble family in France, which allowed him to return to his native land and take up the battle against the philosophes and Catholic accommodationists, which he pursued for years as editor of the Catholic and royalist *Journal ecclasiastique.* Barruel wrote a book on the Revolution,

...sur les vraies causes de la revolution, which appeared in 1789. One year ... he opposed the Jacobins on the issue of divorce, publishing *Lettres sur le ... les vraies principes sur le mariage.*

Barruel felt that the French Revolution was divine punishment meted out ...rance for "having acted as the breeding place of an ideology destructive ...hristian society."[268] The revolution had also been caused by a conspiracy, ...ich he hoped to document when he got to England and had the freedom ...write again. The two explanations were complementary. The anti-Christian ...logy that found such disfavor with God had been put into force by people ...o conceived of the revolution as an attack on the Catholic Church. "If you ...nt a revolution," Mirabeau had said two months before the mob stormed ...Bastille, "you need to decatholicize France."[269]

Three years after the beginning of the Revolution, Mirabeau's followers ...Catholicized France in a horribly literal way. On September 2, 1792, the ...ack on the Catholic Church escalated into an attack on the Catholic clergy. ...four days, 300 priests were massacred and the Abbey of Saint Firmin was ...rned into a prison where priests were subjected to the anticlerical rage of ...e mob. Even a supporter of the revolution like Mme Roland admitted the ...elty of the mob: "Women were brutally violated before being torn to pieces ...those tigers; intestines cut out and worn as turbans; bleeding human flesh ...oured."[270] Some were incarcerated in ships that were then sunk in the ...ne. By the time this rage burned itself out, 20,000 French clergy were ...ing in exile.

On September 26, 1792, Barruel, "with a certain number of French priests ...o had found refuge in a hospitable country,"[271] arrived in London, where ...e took up residence "with an old Jesuit like himself,"[272] the Rev. William ...rickland. Barruel was one of 8,000 to 10,000 members of the Catholic ...rgy who sought refuge in Protestant England. Between September 1792 ...d August 1, 1793, Edmund Burke raised 32,000 pounds sterling for relief of ...e French clergy. King George III turned the royal castle at Winchester into a ...idence for 600 priests. The Archbishop of Canterbury opened his residence ...French bishops who escaped the terror. Barruel was deeply grateful to ...e Anglican clergy, the aristocracy, the businessmen, the citizens of every ...s who had already sent assistance necessary to receive, lodge, nourish and ...ele this colony of unfortunate men."[273] The pope was also grateful for the ...xpected help from one of the Church's most long-standing and tenacious ...mies. In a letter written on September 7, 1792, Pope Pius VI thanked King ...orge III for its generous hospitality. William Pitt, the King's Prime Minister, ...membered those exiles: "Few will ever forget the piety, the irreproachable ...duct, the long and dolorous patience of those men, cast suddenly into the ...st of a foreign people different in its religion, its language, its manners and ...stoms. They won the respect and goodwill of all by a life of unvarying ...ness and decency."[274]

Burke was a dedicated foe of the Revolution, and his *Reflections* helped turn the tide of popular opinion against it. This was no easy task in a country where freemasonry was firmly rooted among the ruling classes, many of whom felt the events in France were the long awaited transposition of the Glorious Revolution to French soil. English radicals like Dr. Price said this explicitly. Mary Wollstonecraft launched her career as the first feminist by attacking Burke. However, her affair with William Godwin, his scandalous memoir of their relationship, and the lifestyle of the Godwin family, coupled with Burke's *Reflections,* soon turned public opinion against them, and England became the Revolution's most determined foe. Burke supported Barruel's work, but he did not see its completion. Burke died two months after the first volume appeared.

On May 1, 1797, Burke wrote to Barruel congratulating him on publication of the first volume of *Memoirs pour servir d'une histoire du jacobinisme*:

> I cannot easily express to you how much I am instructed and delighted by the first Volume of your History of Jacobinism. The whole of the wonderful narrative is supported by documents and proofs with most juridical regularity and exactness. I have known myself personally five of your principal conspirators, and I can undertake to say from my own certain knowledge, that so far back as the year 1773, they were busy in the plot you have so well described, and in the manner, and on the principle you have so truly represented. To this I can speak as a witness.[275]

Volume I of Barruel's *History of Jacobinism* dealt with the Philosophes; Volume II dealt with freemasonry. In Volume II, Barruel concluded the hard core of the French Revolutionaries, the Jacobin cult, was freemasonic. The Freemasons had founded the Jacobin clubs, but the Jacobins turned on the masons when they got control of the revolutionary government. Burke endorsed Barruel's indictment of the philosophes, but did not read the volumes on freemasonry or the Illuminati that appeared after his death.

By the time he finished his book, however, Barruel had backed away from, or at least blunted the force of, his initial assertion. In volumes three and four, Barruel deals with the Illuminati, and in dealing with them Barruel introduced an element of incoherence into his book from which it never recovered. In October 1786, the Bavarian police published their dossier on the Illuminati, the conspiracy to overthrow throne and altar. Adam Weishaupt, a professor at the University of Ingolstadt, led the cabal. Barruel received a copy of the Illuminati dossier; by incorporating it into his *Memoir* he "weakened his main contention,"[276] according to Stanley Jaki.

Joseph de Maistre, the father of continental Counter Revolution, felt the same way about Barruel's *History of Jacobinism.* It was brilliant in parts but defective as a whole. Barruel often confused "the thing with the corruption of the thing"[277] in discussing masonic practices. Both de Maistre and Barruel

were masons, so they knew Illuminism came from Germany. In making Illuminism central to the story of the French Revolution, Barruel put the cart before the horse. Illuminism, according de Maistre, was "an effect and not a cause."[278]

By making German Illuminism the "smoking gun," Barruel let freemasonry off the hook. He also diverted attention from England, which everyone then saw as the historical and geographical source of the Lodge. Even if we eliminate the shadowy Rosicrucian brotherhood of the 1620s, Scottish freemasonry had agents on the continent by the 1650s. Whig-controlled lodges were founded during the first three decades of the 18th century, and their numbers increased dramatically in France up to the outbreak of the French Revolution. It is perverse to discount that activity by shifting responsibility to an organization that came into existence in 1776 and that for the first few years of its existence—until the initiation of the Prussian Baron von Knigge—was little more than a college fraternity. Barruel argues the Illuminati took over existing lodges, but this explanation is not persuasive, given the number of lodges that needed to be subverted, and the time that would take. If German Illuminism is responsible for the French Revolution, Weishaupt and von Knigge had to complete the takeover in the six years following the 1781 masonic convention in Wilhelmsbaden.

Barruel goes out of his way to absolve English lodges of any responsibility for the French Revolution. He has nothing but good to say about English freemasonry: "England in particular is full of those upright men, who, excellent Citizens, and of all stations, are proud of being masons, and who may be distinguished from the others by ties which appear only to unite them more closely in the bonds of charity and fraternal affection."[279] The reader gets the impression that Barruel doth protest too much when he adds: "It is not the fear of offending a nation in which I have found an asylum that has suggested this exception."[280] His defense of English freemasonry is important enough to quote *in extenso*:

> England in particular is full of those upright men, who, excellent Citizens, and of all stations, are proud of being masons, and who may be distinguished from the others by ties which appear only to unite them more closely in the bonds of charity and fraternal affection. It is not the fear of offending a nation in which I have found an asylum that has suggested this exception. Gratitude on the contrary would silence every vain terror, and I should be seen exclaiming in the very streets of London that England was lost, that it could not escape the French Revolution, if its freemason lodges were similar to those of which I am about to treat. I would say more, that Christianity and all government would have long been at an end in England, if it could be ever supposed that her masons were initiated into the last mysteries of the Sect. Long since have their Lodges been sufficiently numerous to execute such a design, had the

> English Masons adopted either the means or the plans and plots of the Occult Lodges.
> This argument alone might suffice to exempt the English Masons in general from what I have to say of the Sect. But there exist many passages in the history of masonry which necessitate this exception. The following appears convincing. At the time when the Illuminees of Germany, the most detestable of the Jacobin crew, were seeking to strengthen their party by that of masonry, they affected a sovereign contempt for the English Lodges. In the letters of Philo to Spartacus, we see the English adepts arriving in Germany from London dawbed all over the with ribbands and emblems of their degrees, but void of those plans and projects against the altar and the crown which tend directly to the point. When I shall have given the history of these Illuminees, the reader will easily judge what immense weight such a testimony carries with it in favor of the English lodges.[281]

Katz's analysis of German lodges tells a different story. The German Freemasons wanted to exclude Jews, but they were consistently thwarted by their high regard for the authority of the Grand Lodge in London. There may well have been upright masons ready to "secede from masonry as soon as they perceived it to be infected by those revolutionary principles which the Illuminees had infused among the brethren," but they did not occupy the higher degrees, which, according to Barruel's own testimony, were suffused with a hatred of Christ and his Church as virulent as the hatred in the Jacobin clubs.

According to Barruel, the English lodges were innocent of "*complot revolutionaire.*" An element of incoherence enters the narrative when he gets to the Bavarian Illuminati: in Volume I, Barruel had already blamed the lodges under Philip d'Orleans for the French Revolution: "This conspiracy only existed among the numerous lodges of the Grand Orient in Paris, directed by Phillippe d'Orleans; they were one of the major causes of the French Revolution."[282] Was Barruel distracted by the Illuminati story? The Bavarian dossier is powerfully factual in the story it lays out. Or did he use that dossier to avert his eyes from the real villains because of his involvement with them? Even granting that freemasonry is a hierarchical esoteric organization that deliberately conceals the secrets of higher degrees from masons in lower degrees, the perceptive reader senses Barruel pulled punches and deliberately portrayed English freemasonry in a falsely positive light because he was beholden to the English, in particular Whigs like Burke, who granted him asylum and supported him financially while he wrote his book.

When Barruel introduces Bavarian Illuminism to explain the corruption of the lodges, he does so as part of a deliberate attempt to exculpate the English: "It is certain that the system of Weishaupt is not a product of the original freemasonry which was organized in London in 1723 [because] the constitution written by Anderson expressly states that a mason may not be 'either a stupid

atheist or a libertine without religion.'"[283] Even leaving aside the ambiguity of Anderson's formulation, Barruel himself provides examples of subversion at the highest degrees of masonry. Even the usually sympathetic Riquet seems unpersuaded by Barruel: "But it is no less certain that Weishaupt infused the libertine and anticlerical spirit of Jacobinism which Barruel denounces, into freemasonry."[284]

In trying to straighten things out, Riquet confuses the issue further by conflating Jacobite and Whig lodges and accepting Anderson's propaganda as the true history of the lodge. Jacob, unable to see Barruel as anything but paranoid, fails to understand the real issue. By concentrating on Barruel's "subsequent embrace of the conspiracy theory as applied to the Freemasons,"[285] she ignores his attribution of the French Revolution to the wrong conspiracy. Constantly associating Barruel with "paranoia," she obviates any need to understand why he would do that.

At one point, Jacob rejects Barruel's dichotomy, claiming, "I know of no record suggesting that French freemasonry was perceived to be markedly different in its fundamental practices and ideals from Dutch, or British or Belgian, or American masonry. . . . When the young Jean Paul Marat visited the Amsterdam lodge in 1774 he would have discovered discourses and ceremonies comparably familiar."[286] This implicates England and the lodge as responsible for the revolution, which then lets the *ancien regime* and its "repression and excesses" off the hook, which then aligns her with the "paranoid" conspiracy school of Barruel. Jacob does not want to be associated with "the themes [Barruel] first proclaimed—among them the persecution of the innocent by the forces of revolution rather than by monarchy, army or police—which recur to this day in the historiography of the French Revolution."[287]

Ultimately Jacob accepts Barruel's dichotomy between English and Continental freemasonry, but only to turn it against him. Jacob claims, "18th century England provides little evidence that freemasonry was ever perceived as a threat to established institutions of either church or state." She continues, "In some places on the Continent, masonry was perceived as subversive of monarchy, social hierarchy, the Catholic church and indeed all forms of organized religion,"[288] thus admitting the ideas which supported the status quo in England were subversive in France.

Freemasonry was not subversive in England because the subversion had already taken place there. In France, however, the philosophes engaged in the subversion of morals. Helvetius taught passion was good and that to moderate the passions was to "ruin the state." Women were taught "Modesty is only an invention of refined voluptuousness:—that Morality has nothing to apprehend from love, for it is the passion that creates genius, and renders man virtuous."[289] He would inform children "the commandment of loving their father and mother is more the work of education than of nature."[290]

He would tell the married couple "the law which condemns them to live together becomes barbarous and cruel on the day they cease to love each other."[291] This subversion of morals extended to King Louis XV, who "without morals was soon surrounded by ministers destitute of faith, who could have seldom deceived him, had his love for religion been stimulated by practice."[292] Barruel says the subversion of morals was caused by an "inundation of bad books."[293] But he doesn't say from where they came, probably because he was unaware of the role Rousset de Missy and the Dutch Huguenots played in bringing subversive English ideas into France. Barruel mentions the Whig radicals, but fails to link them with Whig policy in England when he links the conspiracy to the moment "Collins, Bolingbroke, Bayle, and other masters of Voltaire, together with that Sophister himself, had propagated their impious doctrines against the God of Christianity."[294] Barruel says Voltaire got his ideas in England, but that they weren't subversive there. "This is not the place to observe what a multitude of errors these assertions contain: the chief is that of having converted into a principle what he had observed in England, without considering that often what has conducted one nation to Liberty, may lead another into all the horrors of Anarchy, and thence to Despotism."[295] A simpler explanation is that the Whigs were using the lodges to promote revolution in France, not at home. The English had already killed their king and deposed his heir. They probably wanted to put a pro-Whig, pro-English, pro-Protestant monarch on the French throne, just as they had put William of Orange on the English throne. The subversion of morality led naturally to the hegemony of passion, and when passion got out of control, revolution occurred:

> The French revolution is in its nature similar to our passions and vices: it is generally known, that misfortunes are the natural consequences of indulging them; and one would willingly avoid such consequences: but a faint-hearted resistance is made; our passions and our vices soon triumph, and man is hurried away by them.[296]

Taken on its own terms, Barruel's conspiracy theory shows the Illuminati were peripheral, not the main cause of the revolution, as he would claim in the last volume of the *History of Jacobinism*:

> In order to prove a real Conspiracy against Christianity, we must not only point out the wish to destroy, but also the secret union and correspondence in the means employed to attack, debase, or annihilate it. When, therefore, I name Voltaire and Frederic, Diderot and D'Alembert, as the chiefs of this Antichristian Conspiracy, I not only mean to shew that each individual had impiously written against Christianity, but that they had formed the wish, and had secretly concurred in that wish, to destroy the religion of Christ; that they had acted in concert, sparing no political nor impious art to effectuate that destruction; that they were

the instigators and conductors of those secondary agents whom they had misled; and followed up their plans and projects with all that ardor and constancy which denotes the most accomplished Conspirators.[297]

After staking out contradictory positions to explicate Barruel's contradictory positions, Jacob can't make up her mind. British freemasonry "was antithetical to monarchical absolutism, to the hegemony of the universities and their official teachings, and to the old clerical and aristocratic estates with their social and legal privileges."[298] After claiming Barruel was responsible for "a vast and already paranoid literature that attempted to lay blame for the revolution on the masonic lodges," Jacob concedes "Unquestionably, the masonic lodges and prominent Freemasons did play a political role in the revolution, but it would be naive to imagine that they conspired to bring it about. History simply does not work that way. Yet. . . it would be naive to imagine that masonic lodges. . . possess no discernible political ideology and interest."[299]

To clarify the issue, the revolution was part conspiracy and part nature, and the systematic subversion of morals the philosophes carried out in the name of Enlightenment explains how one part leads to the other. The subversion of morals led the French to the point where passions would careen out of control into revolution. Ideas considered subversive in England were reserved by the Whigs for foreign consumption.

In Barruel's *Memoirs*, the whole is less than the sum of its parts. Barruel brought together hitherto unknown sources that exposed the intentions of the philosophes and their link with the masons. He also exposed the rhetoric of freemasonry by analyzing their rituals in detail, exposing them for the first time publicly. Barruel's analysis of Illuminism had an impact on posterity too, but probably not what he intended. It became an inspiration for cultural revolutionaries from Shelley to Freud, who used its lessons on how to control people without their knowledge as the basis of psychoanalysis, and, through Freud's nephew, Eddie Bernays, as the basis of public relations and advertising. The volumes on Illuminism, while undeniably true, nevertheless derailed the book that set out to explain the causes of the French Revolution. Other writers noticed this. Barruel may have noticed it too; his peculiar title "*Memoirs pour servir. . .*" instead of simply "The History of Jacobinism" may have been a tacit admission he could not write that history himself. All he intended to do was gather the sources so someone else could analyze the material in a way he could not.

Barruel begins his book in France not in Germany. He claims Voltaire got the idea for his conspiracy in England. The book in its original inception points the finger at England not Germany. Voltaire was inspired by his visit to London to "extol the English truths. That is, the impieties of Hume; and when he thought himself authorized to write that in London Christ was spurned."[300] The conspiracy to annihilate Christianity began in 1728 when Voltaire returned

from London to France and announced, "Let the real Philosophers unite in a brotherhood like the Freemasons; let them assemble and support each other, and let them be faithful to the association."[301] Barruel says Voltaire's "most faithful disciples inform us that he had his determination" to consecrate his life "to the annihilation of Christianity," "when in England" even if he spent many years "ruminating alone his hatred against Christ."[302]

The theological foundation of the French Revolution becomes clear in Barruel's exposition of masonic ritual. The philosophes began their assault on the *ancien regime* by subverting morals, but the goal was always theological. Freemasonry's attack on Christ was inspired by the Talmudic literature in the Cabala. Barruel's book powerfully brought together previously unknown material in three important areas—the writings of the philosophes, the Freemasons, and the Illuminati. Its lack of a coherent explanation of how those parts fit together should not blind us to its genius: no one had published anywhere near this volume of material before Barruel. No one had gotten to the theological roots of the revolution in Talmudic Judaism either, because no one had studied the masonic texts in such detail. Barruel witnessed the attack on Christ that began in the Lodge first hand, where it was portrayed as a necessary preliminary to the masonic recovery of the name of Jehovah:

> In his first degree he receives the masonic science only as descending from Solomon and Hiram, and revived by the Knights Templar.—But in the second degree he learns that it is to be traced to Adam himself, and has been handed down by Noah, Nimrod, Solomon, Hugo de Paganis, the founder of the Knights Templars, and Jacques de Molay, their last Grand Master, who each in their turns had been the favourites of Jehovah, and are styled the Masonic Sages. At length in the third degree it is revealed to him, that the celebrated word lost by the death of Hiram was the name of Jehovah. It was found, he is told, by the Knights Templars at the time when the Christians were building a Church at Jerusalem, in digging the foundations in that part on which the stones, which had formerly been parts of the foundation. The form and junction of these three stones drew the attention of the Templars; and their astonishment was extreme, when they beheld the name of Jehovah engraved on the last.

Freemasons are "High Priests of Jehovah." Freemasonry is ultimately judaizing. Its purpose is "recovery of the Lost Name of Jehovah"[303] It proposes to create heaven on earth, the goal of all revolutionaries. As the adept proceeds up the masonic ladder, to higher and higher degrees, he learns first who is responsible for the assassination of Adoniram, one of the builders of Solomon's temple, and what he is expected to do about it. Christ is the "real assassin of Adoniram."[304] Barruel continues, "Christ himself in their eyes is the destroyer of the unity of God, he is the great enemy of Jehovah, and to infuse that hatred of the Sect into the mind of the new adepts, constitutes the grand mystery of the new

degree which they have called Rosicrucian."[305] The great thing that has been lost is the word Jehovah.

The Master asks the Senior Warden what o'clock it is. "It is the first hour of the day, the time when the veil of the temple was rent asunder, when darkness and consternation was spread over the earth, when the light was darkened, when the implements of masonry were broken, when the flaming star disappeared, when the cubic stone was broken, when the word was lost. . . . He thereby learns that the day on which the word Jehovah was lost is precisely that on which the Son of God dying on a Cross for the salvation of mankind is consummated, the grand mystery of our Religion, destroying the sign of every other, whether judaic, natural or sophistical. The more a mason is attached to the word, that is, to his pretended natural Religion, the more inveterate will his hatred be against the author of Revealed Religion.[306]

The deeper the adept penetrates, the more Talmudic are the mysteries revealed to him. The Rosicrucian, for example, is taught the inscription INRI which was nailed to the Cross means not *Iesus Nazarenus Rex Iudaeorum*, but rather the "Iew of Nazareth Led into Iudea,"[307] a reading which deprives Christ of his divinity and reasserts the Talmudic calumny that Christ was a common criminal who deserved to be executed: "As soon as the candidate has proved that he understands the masonic meaning of this inscription INRI, the Master exclaims, My dear Brethren, the word is found again, and all present applaud this luminous discovery, that—He whose death was the consummation and the grand mystery of the Christian Religion was no more than a common Jew crucified for his crimes."[308]

To be initiated into the higher degrees of freemasonry, the adept must agree to become an assassin of the assassin of Adoniram. He must be willing to assassinate Christ and his representatives on earth. The revolutionary intent of freemasonry becomes clear when the adept is informed that he must be willing to kill the king. Mystical Masonry is synonymous with Revolution. Freemasons "looked upon the Revolution as that sacred fire which was to purify the earth and these credulous adepts were seen to second the Revolution with the enthusiastic zeal of a holy cause."[309] When the adept is introduced to the degree of Knights Kadosh, "all ambiguity ceases."[310] The Freemason is the assassin of the assassin of Adoniram, which means it is his duty to kill the king, one of Christ's representatives on earth, the other being the pope.

The English lodges had already carried out their masonic duty by killing the king and deposing his heir, but the French had not. The adept learns he must assassinate the King of France because he is the successor of Philippe le Bel, who deposed Jacques de Molay. During the initiation of the Knights Kadosh, "the candidate" is

> transformed into an assassin. Here it is no longer the founder of Masonry, Hiram, who is to be avenged, but it is Molay the Grand Master of the

> knights Templars and the person who is to fall by the assassin's hand is Philippe le Bel, King of France, under whose reign the order of the Templars was destroyed. . . . When the adept sallies forth from the cavern with the reeking head, he cries Nekom (I have killed him). . . . At length the veil is rent asunder. The adept is informed that till now he has only been partially admitted to the truth; that Equality and Liberty, which had constituted the first secret on his admission into Masonry, consisted in recognizing no superior on earth, and in viewing Kings and Pontiffs in no other light than as men on a level with their fellow men, having no rights to sit on the throne, or to serve at the altar, but what the people had granted them.[311]

The purpose of freemasonry is "to rid the earth of this double pest, by destroying every altar which credulity and superstition had erected and every throne on which were only to be seen despots tyrannizing over slaves."[312] But, again, this admonition is more applicable in France than in England. After admission to the last mysteries, "the brethren are declared free: the word so long sought for is, Deism; it is the worship of Jehovah, such as was known to the Philosophers of nature. The true mason becomes the Pontiff of Jehovah; and as such is the grand mystery by which he is extricated from that darkness in which the prophane are involved."[313]

The entire thrust of masonic activity is motivated by Jewish resentment. When admitted to the degree of Rosae Crucis, the adept learns Christ "destroyed the worship of Jehovah,"[314] and that on Christ and his representatives and on the Gospel "the adept is to avenge the brethren" who are "the Pontiffs of Jehovah." In his reception into the Knights Kadosch, the adept learns

> the assassin of Adoniram is the King, who is to be killed to avenge the Grand Master Molay, and the order of the Masons, successors of the knights Templars. The religion which is to be destroyed to recover the word, or the true doctrine, is the religion of Christ, founded on revelation. This word in its full extent is Equality and Liberty, to be established by the total overthrow of the Altar and the Throne.[315]

The adept is led from secret to secret into the judaized religion of freemasonry, and from there he is led from secret to secret into "the whole Jacobinical code of Revolution."[316] Freemasonry is the crucial link between the ancestral Jewish hatred of Christ and Revolution. Freemasonry is cabalistic. Like Dee, freemasonry derives its magic from Cabala. Like Julian the Apostate and John Dee, the Freemason

> looks upon the communication with, and apparitions of the Devils, whom he invokes under the appellation of Genii, as a special favour, and on them he relies for the whole success of his enchantments. . . . The Cabalistic Mason will be favoured by these good and evil Genii, in proportion to the confidence he has in the power; they will appear to him

> and they will explain more to him in the magic table, than the human understanding can conceive. [317]

"Nor is the adept to fear the company of the evil Genii" as Julian the Apostate did when initiated into the Eleusinian mysteries, because it is only from these "Genii or Devils," that the adept can learn the occult sciences that will infuse into him the spirit of prophecy. He will be informed that Moses, the Prophets, and the three kings, had no other teachers, no other art, but that of Cabalistic Masonry, like him and Nostradamus."[318]

Ultimately, that magic is Jewish. After admission to the higher mysteries, the masonic adept is told: "You have then the same sentiments toward the Christian which the Jews have. Like them, you insist on Jehovah, but to curse Christ and his mysteries."[319]

Taking his lead from Barruel, Poncins proposes two theories explaining the connection between Jews and freemasonry. According to the first,

> Jews have entirely created masonry to corrupt the nations of Christian civilization and to propagate behind this veil the general revolution which is to bring about the domination of Israel. It is simply a tool and a means in the hands of the Jews. In support of this we can quote the article of Dr. Isaac M. Wise published in the Israelite of America, 3 August 1866: "Masonry is a Jewish institution, whose history, degrees, charges, passwords and explanations are Jewish from beginning to end."[320]

The other theory suggests the lodge, good at its inception, was corrupted when the Jews joined it. According to this theory, the Jews joined the lodge during the years preceding the French Revolution

> and founded secret societies themselves. There were Jews with Weishaupt and Martinez de Pasqualis, a Jew of Portuguese origin, organized numerous groups of illuminati in France and recruited many adepts whom he initiated into the dogma of reinstatement. The martinist lodges were mystic, while the other Masonic orders were rather rationalist; a fact which permits us to say that the secret societies represent the two sides of Jewish mentality: practical rationalism and pantheism, that pantheism which although it is a metaphysical reflection of belief in an only God, yet sometimes leads to kabbalistic theurgy. One could easily show the agreements of these two tendencies, the alliance of Cazotte, of Cagliostro, of Martinez, of Saint Martin, of the Comte de St. Germain, of Eckarthausen, with the Enclyclopedists and the Jacobins and the manner in which in spite of their opposition, they arrive at the same result, the weakening of Christianity. That will once again serve to prove that the Jews could be good agents of the secret societies, because the doctrines of these societies were in agreement with their own doctrines, but not that they were the originators of them.[321]

These explanations ignore the fact that every mason became an agent of Jewish revenge when and if he was initiated into the higher mysteries, when he adopted the Talmudic explanation of Christ's death on the Cross and the role he played in suppressing the name of Jehovah. This is perhaps what Disraeli had in mind when he said the Revolution: "which is at this moment preparing in Germany and which will be, in fact a second and greater Reformation, and of which so little is yet known in England is developing entirely under the auspices of the Jews."[322]

Napoleon was a mason. We know this because he was excommunicated from the lodge in 1809. Like Philippe Égalité, Napoleon saw himself as the revolutionary Sun that made the candle of freemasonry unnecessary. Napoleon earned his reputation as a military leader by defeating the half-armed Catholic peasants of the Vendee when they tried to march on Paris to end the revolution. Napoleon proved Plato was right in the *Republic* when he said democracy invariably ends in tyranny. Napoleon learned what to do when men with a "rosary and a scapular in their hands"[323] and "armed with nothing but sticks"[324] charged his artillery. Napoleon then turned his cannon on the revolutionaries themselves and in one of the bloodiest days of the revolution wiped out the mob with grapeshot and became the *Zeitgeist* on horseback. Napoleon took the revolution under control by firing artillery into the mob. From then, he could have said, *"La Revolution, c'est moi."* Napoleon was Liberty, and Equality, and Fraternity.

NAPOLEON BONAPARTE
"IF I GOVERNED A NATION OF JEWS"

If freemasonry prepared Napoleon for his role as assassin and revolutionary, it also gave him the lens through which he saw the Jews. In 1796 Napoleon marched on Italy. As was his custom, a propaganda campaign preceded the artillery barrage. "Peoples of Italy," he wrote in April 1796, "the French army comes to break your chains. We make war as generous enemies, and we have no quarrel save with the tyrants who enslave you."[325] Significantly, his subversive proclamations targeted the Jews:

> Deprived of the rights of citizens, humiliated in many places by the obligation of wearing the medieval yellow badge, confined to the secluded ghettos, the Jews of Italy offered Bonaparte the stirring sight of that persecuted minority. In every Italian city which the French army entered, the ghetto gates were removed, hacked to pieces and burned, the shameful badges thrown away, and the symbols of freedom—Trees of Liberty—planted by the delivered Jews. Their enthusiasm at the great transformation was boundless. For the first time in the history of Italian Jewry the commander of a victorious army appeared not as an oppressor but as a liberator of the Jewish people.[326]

Napoleon's proclamation had its effect on the Jews of Ancona, who plotted with the French to deliver the city. In danger of being slaughtered as traitors, the Jews were saved when the French, led by Napoleon, entered the city. The French soldiers then marched to the Ghetto to tear down its walls, tearing the yellow badges from the clothes of the Jews who greeted them as liberators and replacing those badges with the tricolor of the revolution. In like manner Jews across Europe were recruited into the revolutionary cause in the wake of Napoleon's conquest. Hebrew chroniclers described the liberation of the Italian ghettos as a miracle akin to Moses parting the Red Sea, and from then on Napoleon was known in Jewish circles as *helek tov*, the good portion, a direct rendering of his last name into Hebrew. Napoleon began to take on the aura of the Messiah for the Jews, something he would attempt to manipulate to his advantage over the coming years.

Napoleon cut short his military conquest of Europe and, on May 25, 1798 set sail for Egypt in an armada of 55 warships and 250 supply ships carrying 40,000 soldiers that covered four square miles of the sea. His first conquest was Malta, which quickly incorporated the revolutionary gospel into its constitution. Slavery was abolished, and the Jews were allowed their own synagogue. Napoleon explicitly mentioned the Jews and their good fortune at the hands of the liberating French army in his proclamation on Malta.

Napoleon then sailed for Egypt, arriving on July 1. One day later French troops took Alexandria, and a few days after that Napoleon entered Cairo in triumph, taking up residence at the Ezbekyeh palace. Then the unexpected happened. England, at war with France for five years, caught up with Napoleon when Lord Nelson after searching the Mediterranean for months finally found the French fleet at anchor off the mouth of the Nile. Throwing traditional tactics to the wind, Nelson caught the French off guard by sailing between the fleet and the coast, attacking from the rear and annihilating the largest Armada to sail the Mediterranean since Lepanto.

When the Battle of the Nile ended on August 2, Napoleon found himself in charge of an army that had no way to get back to France. In addition to destroying the French fleet, Nelson imposed a tight blockade on Egypt. Necessity as the Mother of Invention caused Napoleon to revise his plans. Since Turkey had declared war on France, Napoleon would march to the north, defeat the Turkish army and liberate Jerusalem. Napoleon's natural penchant toward megalomania then seems to have taken a mystical turn. Aware the Jews considered him the *helek tov* and Messiah, Napoleon began to think of himself as a combination of Messiah and Antichrist who would fulfill the aspirations of the masonic lodges by restoring the name of Jehovah, emancipating the Jews, and rebuilding the Temple. Napoleon was the new Moses, come out of Egypt to lead the Jews to the Promised Land, which their forbears lost when Christ suppressed the name of Jehovah. Napoleon was the conqueror of Alexandria and the successor to Alexander, who had

also granted the Jews significant privileges. He was Herod; he was Cyrus. Were he to rebuild the Temple, he would succeed where Julian the Apostate failed. Were he to restore the Temple he would be Messiah and Antichrist, synonymous terms to the Jews, and the revolution most certainly would have succeeded in crushing the wretch, the project Voltaire had assigned to it and its masonic acolytes.

On September 7, Napoleon appointed Sabbato Adda and Tibi di Figurea, two "*grand pretres de la nation juive*" as his advisors. The title "high priest" that Napoleon gave these Jewish advisors indicated a restoration of the old dispensation was imminent. "A company of Jews," we are told, "spoke of the [French] Commander-in-Chief as the second Messiah."[327] Or was Napoleon the second Gideon? Was Napoleon going to succeed where all other Gideons—Zizka, Muentzer, Cromwell, et al.—had failed? With the exception of Julian the Apostate, who did not see himself as Gideon, none of those messianic revolutionaries got as close as Napoleon to the mystical center of judaizing revolutionary fervor.

As the French army advanced along the east coast of the Mediterranean, events seemed to confirm Napoleon's vision of himself as Antichrist/Messiah. In Jaffa, the French massacred 4,000 Ottoman soldiers and a large number of citizens. Then the army advanced to the Plain of Esdraelon, at the foot of Mount Tabor, where Napoleon routed the Syrian army of 30,000 men. Napoleon then ascended Mount Tabor, where he seems to have undergone a transfiguration of his own. Here Gideon had defeated the Amalekites, and here Christ revealed himself as the Son of God to a small group of his followers in the company of Elijah and Moses, as the fulfillment of the Law and the Prophets. It would not be surprising if Napoleon, swept up in the drama, saw himself as the avatar of a new dispensation described in masonic rituals as the man appointed to restore what had been lost.

Flush with the victory and the vision, Napoleon conceived a Proclamation to the Jews. "I will announce to the people the abolition of servitude and of the tyrannical government of the Pashas. I shall arrive at Constantinople with large masses of soldiery. I shall overturn the Turkish empire."[328] Soon the Jews of Syria, their oppressors crushed by the *helek tov*, voiced the hope Napoleon would restore Solomon's Temple after he took Acre.

Napoleon issued his proclamation on April 20, 1799, announcing he would restore the Jews to their ancestral home. "Arise then, with gladness, ye exiled!" Napoleon exclaimed. He had come to avenge the Jews for "the almost 2000 year old ignominy put upon you":

> "Hasten! Now is the moment which may not return for thousands of years, to claim the restoration of your rights among the population of the universe which had been shamefully withheld from you for thousands of years, your political existence as a nation among the nations, and the

> unlimited natural right to worship Jehovah in accordance with your faith, publicly and in likelihood for ever (Joel 4:20).[329]

Napoleon was going to fulfill simultaneously the hopes of the Jews and the Freemasons. Napoleon was going to restore what had been lost—the name of Jehovah, the state of Israel, and the Temple, where the Jews could again offer their sacrifices. Napoleon intended "to rebuild the walls of the orphaned city and temple to the Lord in which His Glory shall dwell from now for evermore."[330] To help accomplish this, Napoleon, draping the mantle of Gideon over his own shoulders, summoned the Jews of the world to Jerusalem: "Let all men of Israel, capable of bearing arms gather and come up to us, let even the weak say: I am strong . . . and let the whole people cry as of Gideon, son of Joash, Judges 7: 'Here the Sword of the Lord and of Bonaparte!'" Napoleon invented Zionism a century before the Jews did, referring to them as "the Rightful Heirs of Palestine."[331]

The Jews were ecstatic; their deliverance was at hand! In response to Napoleon's proclamation, a mysterious figure who called himself Aaron, son of Levi, Rabbi of Jerusalem, exclaimed to his fellow Jews:

> Brethren! The so glorious prophecies contained therein have been, as to their larger part, already fulfilled by the victorious army of the great nation, and now it depends only on us, to behave not as the children of harlots and adulteresses, but as true descendants of Israel and to desire the inheritance of the people of the Lord and the beautiful services of the Lord, Psalm of David 27:4.[332]

Later Jewish scholars saw Napoleon's statement as an attempt to manipulate the Jews, but this cynicism was missing from statements of the Jews at the time, who were caught up once again in messianic fervor. Barbara Tuchman called Napoleon's proclamation "a meaningless gesture, as artificial as any heroic strutting on the stage."[333] Simon Dubnow called it a "trick."[334] Salo Baron referred to Napoleon's "shrewd recognition of the intense interest of the Jews, whom he attempted to enlist in his expeditionary army,"[335] but Baron admits "the support the Jewish hope he had received from French and English writers" indicated how much "the European atmosphere was charged with these messianic expectations."[336]

Both views were probably accurate. The Jews of his day viewed Napoleon with "messianic expectations," and in issuing his proclamation, Napoleon sought to exploit those expectations for his own benefit. Napoleon "was aware of the prominent position which some sectors of Western and Oriental Jewry held in finance and commerce." Napoleon knew that the Jews had "immense riches," and he probably hoped to tap those riches by enlisting the Jews in restoring the Temple, just as Julian the Apostate had done.[337] In a project as grandiose as restoring the Temple, the mystical, financial, and political

benefits would converge in the masonic mind. They would not work against each other.

A Report on Napoleon's Proclamation to the Jews appeared in *Le Moniteur Universel*, the official government newspaper, on May 22, 1799. "Bonaparte," it said, "caused to publish a proclamation, in which he invites all the Jews of Asia and Africa to come and range themselves under his banners in order to reestablish ancient Jerusalem."[338] The report hoped Jews "will perhaps see in him [Bonaparte] the Messiah, and soon 20 prophecies will have predicted the event, the epoch, and even the circumstances of his coming. It is at least very probable that the Jewish people is about to transform itself again into a national body, that the Temple of Solomon will be rebuilt."[339]

Napoleon concluded his proclamation by announcing "the undefiled army which Providence has sent me hither, led by justice and accompanied by victory, has made Jerusalem my headquarters."[340]

Napoleon, however, never made it to Jerusalem. On April 24, Napoleon ordered an assault on Acre, but the French troops were beaten back by a combination of tenacious soldiers behind impregnable walls and English artillery from ships offshore. Napoleon tried again on April 25, May 1, 7, 8, and 10, and he failed each time. Finally, on May 20, under the cover of an artillery barrage, Napoleon abandoned the siege of Acre and began his withdrawal from Syria. Like Julian the Apostate before him, Napoleon was a messiah who failed. He gave up the project of restoring the Temple.

Le Moniteur tried to put a positive spin on the defeat, claiming, "it is not only to give Jerusalem back to the Jews that Bonaparte has conquered Syria."[341] Once again their messiah disappointed the Jews. As in Germany and the Pale of the Settlement after Napoleon's defeat in Russia, the Jews were singled out as traitors. To exculpate themselves, the Jews sought to suppress Napoleon's proclamation to the Jews, as well as any evidence they had supported him.

In Napoleon's absence, French armies had suffered defeats in both Germany and Italy, and so, having failed to restore the Temple, Napoleon left Egypt on August 23. One year later, in an address to the State Council, Napoleon made veiled reference to his religious beliefs as well as his failed attempt to restore the temple: "It was by becoming a Catholic that I ended the Vendee war. It was by becoming a Musulman that I established myself in Egypt. . . . If I governed a nation of Jews I should reestablish the Temple of Solomon."[342]

His use of the subjunctive case is instructive. News of his failed attempt to restore the Jews to their homeland and to rebuild the temple spread despite his attempts to repress it. England still harbored those who carried on the tradition of Menasseh ben Israel and the Fifth Monarchy Men, who felt it was England's role to restore the Jews. In 1799 Henry Kett, in *History, the Interpreter of Prophecy,* felt that Napoleon, as the embodiment of Revolutionary Republicanism, was manipulating the Jews "to render them subservient to their designs of universal conquest."[343] The English wanted to

[illegible] in the Apocalypse on their terms, not Napoleon's. The revolutionary [illegible] of the 1640s was complicated by the fact that France, not England, [illegible] the bearer of the revolutionary banner. As a result, English Jews were [illegible] of harboring revolutionary sympathies. There were anti-Jewish riots [illegible] Ipswich, and the Alien Act of 1793 threatened Jews with deportation.

As a result the Jews in England did not respond to Napoleon's call. But [illegible] elsewhere did. News of the French Messiah reached Prague in 1798. By [illegible] summer of 1799 messianic expectation was running high there probably [illegible] because copies of Napoleon's proclamation were circulating there. The Jews [illegible] Napoleon was the Messiah because he had conquered Rome, imprisoned [illegible] pope, and "crushed the power of Edom." Not surprisingly, one Jewish [illegible] that responded eagerly to the idea *Helek Tov* was the Messiah were [illegible] followers of Shabbetai Zevi known as Frankists. As one contemporary [illegible] chronicler put it:

> The overturn of the papal throne has already sufficiently nourished their fancies. Publicly they declared that this is a sign of the approaching Messiah, for this constitutes their main belief: Sabath Zebe was the Messiah and remains the Messiah, but always in another form. The conquests of the General Bonaparte gave nourishment to their superstitious doctrine. His conquests in the Orient, particularly the conquest of Palestine, of Jerusalem, his proclamation to the Israelites is oil on their flame, and it is believed that this is the very root of the connection between them and the society of Frank. However, how? and What for? Who can know this?[344]

Frankists derived their name from Jacob Frank, an eastern European Jew, [illegible] Judah ben Judah Leibowicz, a few years after but not far from where [illegible] Shem Tov, the founder of Hasidic Judaism, was born. If the Hasid were [illegible] Jewish version of the Quietist sects that had sprung up in reaction to [illegible] Enlightenment, the Frankists were a remnant of the revolutionary and [illegible] messianic sects who troubled England in the mid-17th century. By 1666, the [illegible] messianic flame had sputtered out in England, but it had become a raging blaze [illegible] the Ottoman Empire. Jacob Frank ended up in Turkey after the orthodox [illegible] rabbis expelled his family from Poland. While in Turkey, he converted to [illegible] Sabbatean Doenmeh (the Turkish word for *converso*) sect and became its [illegible] leader. When he returned to Podolia, he was recognized by the Sabbateans [illegible] the reincarnation of Sabbatai Zevi. Frank eventually was baptized as a [illegible] Christian and received the favor of the empress of Austria—the King of Poland [illegible] his godfather—but his career was clouded by accusations of "voluntary [illegible] Marranism," so no one could determine whether he and his followers were [illegible] sincere Christian converts or instead implementing the principle "We must [illegible] descend into the realm of evil in order to vanquish it from within." Frank [illegible] ended up living in a palatial residence surrounded by beautiful attendants and

rumors of the same orgiastic sexual practices that had made Sabbatai Zevi notorious.

The Prague Frankists did not convert to Christianity but continued to practice a Judaism heavily influenced by Cabala. Jonas Beer Wehle, their leader, was a devotee not only of Isaac Luria and Sabbatai Zevi but also Moses Mendelssohn and Immanuel Kant, which made Prague Frankists strikingly similar in their intellectual beliefs to Freemasons. They were especially receptive to Napoleon's portrayal of himself as the Revolutionary Messiah. Once the Jews in Prague had heard that Napoleon had crushed Rome, they saw Napoleon as fulfilling the Sabbatean mission Nathan of Gaza had carried out at Zevi's request. "[T]he cabbalist circle around Jonah Beer Wehle could not help interpreting the event as foreboding of the coming of Sabbatai Zevi's second and last successor."[345]

Napoleon found dealing with the Jews more difficult than he had imagined when he conceived his proclamation at the summit of Mount Tabor. In 1806, after the battle of Austerliez, while making a triumphal return to Paris, Napoleon stopped in Strasbourg. Here, in a city with one of the largest Jewish populations in western Europe, the Alsatians were skeptical, because of long experience, about Jews becoming citizens, even though the revolution had granted them that privilege 15 years before. The Jews had exploited the situation through usury. In the turmoil following the revolution, they had lent money to aspiring bourgeois who wanted to buy property the revolutionary government had stolen from the Church. When the value of the assignat collapsed, the borrowers were unable to repay their loans. So Napoleon was assailed in Strasbourg with complaints about the Jews.

Disturbed by what he learned in Strasbourg, Napoleon decided to convoke an assembly of Jews when he got back to Paris. He called that assembly the Sanhedrin, indicating he still hadn't abandoned his messianic fantasy. The ostensible purpose was to see whether Jews considered themselves loyal citizens of France. Some suspected Napoleon of ulterior motives. Prince Klemens von Metternich, the Austrian stateseman who was the architect of post-Napoleonic Europe, felt Jews looked upon Napoleon as their Messiah, an idea which he encouraged so he could mobilize the vast Jewish population of Poland in his campaign against Russia. Jews, according to Metternich, were natural revolutionaries who already felt estranged from the rulers of the countries where they resided. It wouldn't take much to turn that resentment into support for Napoleonic France as the vehicle of world revolution.

Napoleon issued a decree on May 30, 1806 summoning a General Synagogue of the Jews in Paris on June 15. Napoleon scheduled the first meeting on a Saturday, causing an immediate split between orthodox and reform Jews. When they finally assembled on February 4, 1807, Napoleon put the Jews on the defensive by questioning their loyalty as Frenchmen. "The question at issue," according to one of the Jews in attendance,

was to ascertain from the Jews themselves, if their religion was really permitted them to take up citizenship in such countries as were ready to grant it to them; whether that religion did not embody prescriptions which rendered impossible, or at least very difficult, an entire submission to the laws. Lastly, whether there were any means by which it were possible to turn to the advantage of society as a whole the talents of a population which so far had shown itself its avowed enemy.[346]

The fourth question was "do the Jews regard Frenchmen as their brethren or as aliens?"[347] Napoleon thus maneuvered the Jews into a trap. When asked whether were loyal to France, the Jews did not waste time writing down their answer but replied in one voice *"Jusqu'a la mort!"* If the Jews were serious about accepting Napoleon as their Messiah, he was going to make sure they accepted him on his terms, not theirs. Secretly embarrassed by his proclamation promising them a homeland in Palestine, Napoleon had learned a lesson. Taking a cue from the Catholic Church, Napoleon made France the equivalent of the New Israel. Now there was neither Jew nor Greek in France. Jews would find the fulfillment of their natural inclination to revolution in Napoleon, the embodiment of the revolutionary spirit. Napoleon promised to recognize Jews as French citizens as long as they recognized France as the revolutionary Israel and Napoleon as the Revolutionary Messiah. He had convoked the Sanhedrin to show the Jews how to find Jerusalem in France. The position of the Jews was analogous to the position of the Freemasons. Once the revolutionary sun rose in the sky, the candle of Jewish revolutionary agitation was no longer necessary. In proclaiming their loyalty as Frenchmen, the Jews of the Sanhedrin were also to proclaim France the new Israel, which would replace the Old Israel as the object of their loyalty. Napoleon wanted the Sanhedrin to declare "Jews are obliged to defend France as they defended Jerusalem, because they are treated in France as if they were in the Holy Land. The commissars were instructed to impress upon the members of the Assembly the feeling. . . to make them find Jerusalem in France."[348]

Napoleon thought that after the convocation of the Sanhedrin the Jews would recognize the French as fellow Jews and stop collecting interest on their loans. "Paris . . . will inaugurate for the dispersed remnants of Abraham's posterity a period of salvation and happiness."[349] Since Napoleon embodied revolution, the revolutionary Jews were to accept him as their king. Napoleon said as much to his Irish physician and biographer, Dr. O'Meara, who felt his reasons for "for having encouraged the Jews so much" still needed clarification. The reason was simple: "as I had restored them to all their privileges, and made them equal to my other subjects, they must consider me like Solomon or Herod to be the head of their nation, and my subjects as brethren of a tribe similar to theirs."[350] That meant the Jews could not then collect interest from other Frenchmen, or conversely that all Frenchmen now had the privileges of the Jews when it came to finance. After Napoleon convoked the Sanhedrin, the

Jews "were not permitted to deal usuriously with them [i.e., other Frenchmen] or me, but to treat us as if we were of the tribe of Judah. . . . Besides, I should have drawn great wealth to France, as the Jews were very numerous and would have flocked to a country where they enjoyed such privileges. Moreover, I wanted to establish a universal liberty of conscience and thought to make all men equal, whether Protestants, Catholics, Mohammedans, Deists or others. . . . I made everything independent of religion."[351] Or everything part of the judaized religion known as Revolution.

Napoleon was in the Pale of the Settlement when the Sanhedrin finally convened, but Napoleon's convocation of the Sanhedrin, which caused a sensation throughout Europe, did not move the Jews of eastern Europe to support his military campaign. They gave up neither their ethnocentrism nor their economic practices. Caught between the two colossi, Russia and France, they hedged their bets and hoped they wouldn't get caught in the reaction that inevitably followed when Jews supported a revolution that failed.

Napoleon's convocation of the Jews and his attempt to recruit them as revolutionaries had additional negative effects. By using the word Sanhedrin, Napoleon sent a shock through the counter-revolutionary movement that reverberated for another century. When Joseph Cardinal Fesch heard that his nephew had convoked the Sanhedrin, he reportedly asked Napoleon "Do you want to bring about the end of the world?" "Do you not know," he continued, "that the Holy Scriptures predict the end of the world for the moment when the Jews will be recognized as a corporate nation?"[352] Impressed by his uncle's argument, Napoleon dissolved the Sanhedrin.

That account may be apocryphal, but conservative reaction to the word Sanhedrin was not. In August 1806, Abbe Barruel, living again in France, received a letter from an Italian military officer, Jean-Baptiste Simonini. Simonini had read Barruel's *History of Jacobinism* with gratitude for "finding an infinite of things depicted in it which I had also witnessed with my own eyes."[353] Simonini, however, wondered why Barruel did not mention the Jews who had used "their money to sustain and multiply the modern sophists, the Freemasons, the Jacobins and the Illuminati."[354] Simonini concluded the Jews joined with those groups to form "a single faction to annihilate, if that were possible, the name Christian." During the revolution in the Piedmont region, where he was born, Simonini passed for a Jew and was admitted to the lodge there, where he learned the Jews claimed that by using all means available to them, they would rule the world in less than a century, abolish all other sects to rule over them, "and reduce all of the Christians to a veritable slavery."[355]

Barruel made two copies of the letter and sent one, via Cardinal Fesch, to Napoleon. That letter eventually made its way to M. Desmarets, director of the imperial police, who had been keeping the Jews under surveillance. The other copy went to the pope along with a cover letter asking his holiness what confidence Barruel should place in Simonini's revelations. A few months

later Barruel received a reply from the pope's secretary, Msgr. Testa, which confirmed what Simonini said. Barruel was no philo-Semite. He had described Talleyrand as possessing "all of the lowness and all of the vices of Judaism,"[356] but he refused to publish Simonini's letter or the pope's response because he feared innocent Jews would suffer reprisals. "I guarded the contents of the letter with a profound silence, convinced that it would lead to a massacre of the Jews."[357] In 1878, Pere Grivel said of Barruel, who died in 1820, that he wrote his *Memoirs* to convert the Jews, not to have them massacred.

Ignoring Barruel's suppression of the Simonini letter, Daniel Pipes, in his book *Conspiracy*, holds Barruel responsible for "the myth of the Jewish world conspiracy," which was unmentioned in Barruel's *Memoirs*, and also for laying some of the intellectual foundations for the views that eventually culminated in the Soviet and Nazi regimes."[358] In demonizing Barruel as "this evil man" whose "wicked ideas"[359] led to Auschwitz and the Gulag, Pipes proves that anti-conspiracy theories are even more florid than conspiracy theories.

Eventually the Revolution, with Napoleon at its head, destroyed itself and the Enlightenment that created it and ushered in the Romantic Catholic reaction. Twenty-five years of suffering from bad ideas purged France of the facile optimism and sensuality of the Enlightenment and paved the way for a religious revival no one expected. It also brought about continental conservatism under the leadership of Joseph de Maistre, "one of the most important formative influences on French thought in the early 19th century."[360] De Maistre had spent the revolutionary era in Russia as an impecunious diplomat representing the House of Savoy. "What we are witnessing," he wrote after the failure of revolution, "is a religious revolution; the rest, immense as it seems, is but an appendix."[361] De Maistre "regarded the Revolution as a cleansing fire in which the forces of evil were employed against their will and without their knowledge as agents of purification and regeneration."[362]

Eventually Heinrich Heine would give voice to the Jewish revulsion at the Catholic revival, and like Karl Marx at mid-century, urge a return to revolution, but in the meantime, the revulsion at things French and revolutionary was as vehement as the attraction to things German and Catholic. The counter-revolutionary movement took the name Romanticism in Germany, and the term soon got misapplied in English-speaking lands to figures like Percy Shelley. Before the term got corrupted, De Maistre was its foremost representative, and he represented Catholicism and royalism in support of the moral law and social order that would hold Europe together, in spite of recurrent revolutionary episodes, from the Congress of Vienna in 1814-15 to the outbreak of World War I, a century later.

Like De Maistre and Metternich, the Russians saw Napoleon's Sanhedrin as a plot to use the Jews to destroy the Church of Christ. The Jews of the Pale of the Settlement did not join Napoleon because of ancestral Jewish suspicion and not for any lack of trying on Napoleon's part. But in his march

on Russia, Napoleon planted the seed of modern revolution in exceptionally fertile ground, and that sowing would bear fruit throughout the 19th century, culminating in the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917. From the assassination of the Czar in 1881, the Russian secret police suspected the Jews as the driving force behind revolutionary activity. The Holy Synod of Moscow was prescient, viewing Napoleon's convocation of the Sanhedrin in 1806 as the beginning of a larger attack on Russia and the Church of Christ:

> In order to bring about a debasement of the Church, he [Napoleon] has convened to Paris the Jewish synagogues, restored the dignity of the rabbis and founded a new Hebrew Sanhedrin, the same infamous tribunal which once dared to condemn our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ to the Cross. And now he has the impudence to contemplate the unification of the Jews whom God in His wrath has dispersed over the surface of the earth and to organize all of them for the destruction of the Church of Christ to the purpose—oh, unspeakable audacity surpassing all the misdeeds!—that they may proclaim the Messiah in the person of Napoleon.[363]

The "Messiah" spread revolution and freemasonry in every country in Europe, infecting even the countries that ultimately defeated him in battle. He inaugurated the Revolution which would continue for another century at least in Europe and South America. Eventually, the revolution would blow back to England. Young Percy Shelley caught the revolutionary virus by reading William Godwin's book and running off with his daughter, but also by reading Barruel on the Illuminati and using what was supposed to be a warning against revolution as a manual for its implementation.

Just as the German romantic glorification of things Catholic followed as the inevitable reaction against French Enlightenment and Revolution, there was an inevitable reaction against the Jews when Napoleon was defeated. The Hep Hep riots took place in Frankfurt, stronghold of Jewish bankers. Pope Pius VII rebuilt the ghetto walls and made Jews listen to sermons and put their yellow badges back on. During the Congress of Vienna in 1814-15, the "Jewish Question" made its debut as an international issue.

The Jews, however, carried Napoleon's memory forward into other revolutions and movements. They looked back on the Napoleonic era as their "Paradise Lost" and, encouraged by what Napoleon had accomplished, were determined to resurrect that paradise in a more powerful future revolution. The German Jewish poet and contemporary of Karl Marx, Heinrich Heine created the Legend of Napoleon the Liberator, portraying him as "the Moses of the French . . ."[364] Heine proclaimed his undying faith in the Messiah that failed: "I have never swerved from my faith in the Emperor. I have never ceased to doubt his advent—My Emperor—the ruler of the people for the people."[365] Napoleon was "the secular savior"[366] for the Jews. To make sure

readers did not confuse this Jewish savior with one who had died on the
1800 years earlier, Heine continued: "We who have adopted a different
bolism see in the martyrdom of Napoleon at St. Helena no expiation in
sense here indicated, for the Emperor there did penance for his most fatal
for his faithlessness to his mother, the Revolution."[367] By the mid-19th
revolution had again become the religion of significant numbers of
Since most Jews lived in Russia, Russia would become the focus of
olutionary activity after France's defeat.

Theodore Herzl, founder of Zionism, was another acolyte for Napoleon,
king up the torch Heine had kept burning until the mid-19th century.
erywhere he went in Paris, Herzl felt Napoleon's presence: "There is nothing
re new than Napoleon I. Truly, he is not yet dead. Every night he leaves
tomb under the dome of the Invalides and talks from all possible stages to
wonderful and variable people of France."[368] In a letter to Bismarck, Herzl
he derived "the idea to which I am devoted" from Napoleon, in particular
his "Paris Sanhedrin of the Jews of 1806," in which Herzl saw "a feeble
verberation" of the Zionism that would play an important role in world
litics during the next century.[369]

Chapter Fourteen

The Revolution of 1848

The Enlightenment reached its theoretical high point in 1783 with the performance of Gotthold Ephraim Lessing's play *Nathan der Weise* in Berlin. No work of art produced by the Enlightenment epitomized its central tenets better than *Nathan der Weise*. The play was an essentially Masonic subversion of not only Christianity but Judaism and Islam as well, and was in the tradition of *Le Traite des Trois Imposteurs*. After its premier in Berlin, performances of *Nathan* were banned in Frankfurt and Vienna by civic authorities who recognized its essentially subversive nature, but after the German defeat in World War II, the play became a fixture in the de-Nazified German educational system. *Oberprimaner* were forced to read it at the Gymnasium and internalize its subversive message, namely, that all religions are equally false and that only those who rise above the confessional boundaries separating Christians, Jews and Muslims are truly wise.

The model for Nathan was Lessing's friend Moses Mendelssohn, who arrived in Berlin in 1743 as a 14-year-old unable to speak the language. Until his arrival in Berlin Mendelssohn had studied the Talmud. After his arriving and acquiring the ability to read German, which was of course related to the Yiddish he had spoken as a child, Mendelssohn immersed himself in the classics of the Enlightenment—Spinoza, Newton, Montesquieu, Rousseau, and Voltaire—and as a result of his reading made the acquaintance of the philosophes of Berlin, most notably Lessing, who wrote for the *Vossische Zeitung*, and Nicolai, in whose garden the three men would discuss literature and philosophy.

Mendelssohn soon became a writer in his own right, publishing *Philosophical Dialogues*, followed by *Letters on Sentiment* in 1755, and an adaptation of Plato's *Phaedo* subtitled a treatise on "The Immortality of the Soul in Three Dialogues" in 1767. But it was less as a writer and more as a role model for the newly emerging Jews of Berlin and Germany that Mendelssohn achieved fame. Partly through the efforts of his friend Lessing, he became the embodiment of the Age of Enlightenment.

Mendelssohn was the Jewish Ben Franklin. By the end of his life, the boy who had arrived penniless in Berlin in 1743, had become one of Berlin's most illustrious citizens. Like Franklin he became a paradigm of the Enlightened Man. Mendelssohn was not the first European Jew to make a name for himself as a philosopher—that honor went to Spinoza—but he was the first European Jew to be fully assimilated into high German culture. Unlike Spinoza, who was expelled from an uncomprehending synagogue, Mendelssohn was not only honored by the Jews of his day, he became their model of the new Jew. He attained these heights by his writings but more importantly by refusing to convert to Christianity; he wanted to show that in an Enlightened culture, Jews could escape from the ghetto without converting to Christianity. A conversion was, of course still necessary, but Mendelssohn's conversion was to the culture of the German Enlightenment, which was deeply imbued with the spirit of freemasonry.

Nathan der Weise was a profoundly Masonic play primarily because it proposed for the first time in history an alternative to the Catholic and Jewish positions which had existed since the time of Christ's crucifixion. According to the traditional Christian position, supported by both text and iconography, the Jews were blind. The symbol of the synagogue on the facade of the Cathedral in Freiburg is of a blindfolded woman. Jews are blind, according to the Christian point of view, because the Messiah came and they failed to recognize his coming. In a document issued on March 25, 1928, the Holy Office, the predecessor of the current Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, issued a statement "Concerning the Abolition of the Association Popularly Known as 'The Friends of Israel,'" in which it announced that the Catholic Church "has always been accustomed to pray for the Jewish people, who were the bearers of Divine Revelation up to the time of Jesus Christ: this despite, indeed on account of their subsequent blindness."

The Jewish position derived from their rejection of Christ and would perdure beyond the Enlightenment. Christians, according to this Jewish view, are not blind; they are credulous and self-deluded. Christians believe an impossible fairy tale about Christ rising from the dead. Because Christianity has nonetheless prospered for the past 2000 years, the Jew, religious or not, naturally tends to be a debunker, who comes up with ever new variations on a common theme: everyone thinks such and such, but the real story is this. So for Marx, everything is economic, for Freud, Moses was really an Egyptian and "all men" really want to have sex with their mothers and sisters, and for Derrida, meaning is really an illusion.

The third position is the Enlightenment position, and it received its most cogent artistic formulation in Lessing's play *Nathan der Weise*, which, as we have seen, takes an agnostic Masonic attitude toward Christianity, Judaism, and Islam. *Nathan der Weise* proposed a new paradigm for Jewish life in Germany. Set in the Holy Land during the 13th century, *Nathan* is

essentially a dialogue between representatives of the three religions. When the dialogue threatens to reach an impasse, Nathan breaks the stalemate in which each religion insists on its own monopoly of truth by proposing the famous parable of the rings. God created the one ring, which symbolizes true religion, but there are many rings, and each man venerates his ring as from God. Lessing solves this problem by having Nathan claim that all rings are to be venerated because no one knows who has the real ring. During their 10th year of schooling, German Catholics and Lutherans, members of the state's two established religions, learn that the real ring, symbolizing the true religion "*war nicht Erweislich*," "was nowhere to be found."[1] Just like "the true religion," Nathan the Wise adds for those who are slow in picking up the Enlightenment's solution to the religious wars of the 17th century.

Pious German Catholics and Lutherans are in for even more instruction. All three representatives of the world's major religions are "deceived deceivers":

> All three of you [Muslim, Christian, Jew] are deceived deceivers.
> None of your rings is genuine. The true ring
> Has been lost. And in order to disguise the loss
> The father has created three instead of one.[2]

With Saladin cheering him on from the sidelines—"*Herrlich! Herrlich!*"—Nathan continues to propound the doctrine of religious relativism which is to be the basis for social order in enlightened German states like Prussia:

> My advice to you is to accept the situation for what it is.
> If one of you has his ring from his father,
> then he should believe that his ring is the real ring,
> because it's just possible that the Father has had enough of the
> Tyranny of the One Ring and will no longer tolerate it in his house[3]

Over 200 years after its first performance, Jews still find the play and its vision of religious indifferentism inspiring. Amos Elon sees

> Lessing's Nathan is the antithesis of Shakespeare's Shylock. The play boldly attacks all religious and national prejudice; the idea of a "better god" is absurd, the propagating of the idea a cause for "pious rage." Not faith but moral behavior is the essence of all religion. In beautiful blank verse, Lessing restates the finest ideal of the Enlightenment—tolerance, brotherhood, and love for humanity. Set in Jerusalem, during the Crusades, the play builds to a high point with Nathan's parable of three miraculous rings given by a father to his three sons. Symbols of Christianity, Judaism and Islam, the rings assure each son the love of God and men if he but wears his in good faith.[4]

In Nathan, the Jew and the freemason merge into one Enlightened cosmopolitan. "*Ich bin ein Mensch,*" "I am a human being," is Nathan's response to Saladin's inquiry about questions of identity that usually require

ethnic or religious answers. Mendelssohn became the model for those who "sought a larger community of rational men beyond the stagnant confines of religious identity."[5] He also became a model for Jewish assimilation, at first in Germany, and then as the Enlightenment spread eastward for the overwhelming majority of Jews in the world. According to Barbara Tuchman,

> The process begins with the "Enlightenment" initiated by Moses Mendelssohn in 18th century Germany, which shattered the protective shell of orthodoxy and opened the way to acquaintance with Western culture and participation in Western affairs. The reign of the Talmud and the rabbis was broken. All over Europe the shattered windows were flying open. Jews read Voltaire and Rousseau, Goethe and Kant. The reform movement followed, shedding the old rituals, trying to adjust Judaism to the modern world. Civil Emancipation became the goal. In 1791 the French Constituent Assembly had decreed citizenship for the Jews; Napoleon confirmed it wherever he had dominion. Reaction rescinded it, and thereafter it had to be fought for separately in each country. Civil Emancipation was won around the middle of the 19th century, and if it had been a success, Judaism would have ended there. But it was not; and in the process of discovering why not, the Jews discovered nationalism. They became aware that Judaism was dying; on the one hand petrifying into a dry husk of rabbinical mumbo jumbo, and on the other dissolving in the open air of Western "enlightenment."[6]

There is a note of violence implicit in Tuchman's description of the "shattered shell of orthodoxy," as if breaking the reign of the Talmud were akin to splitting the atom because of all the destructive energy it released. Whether intentional or not, the comparison was apt because the Enlightenment in both Germany and, more importantly, Russia opened the Jews of the shtetl to the spirit of revolution when Mendelssohn's vision exposed the world of Kahal and the rabbis as so much "rabbinical mumbo jumbo."

Mendelssohn became the paradigmatic Enlightenment Jew and a model for Jews who wanted to leave the Polish shtetls of the East behind and become part of German culture. He also became the model Jew for the Germans, who were debating whether to grant the Jews the rights of citizens in the wake of Napoleon's defeat.

In 1792 Salomon Maimon, one of Kant's Jewish critics and a refugee from the Pale of the Settlement, published his autobiography. Maimon's book gave expression to Jewish hatred of the Talmud and the Kahal in a memoir about his life growing up as a Jew in the shtetls of "darkest Lithuania."[7] He abandoned that life, along with his wife and children, and, like Mendelssohn, headed to Berlin to free his mind of the chains of "Talmudic darkness,"[8] which kept the Jews of the east "bent over this mind-killing business of attempting to create meaning where none existed, expending our wits raising contradictions where

never appeared, and sharpening those we could discern. We spent endless years quibbling our way through long chains of conclusions, chasing after shadows and building castles in the air."[9]

Germany was the source of ideas for the Jews of the East. The reason for that is not hard to understand. German was easier for Jews to understand than Slavic languages like Russian or Polish because the Jews spoke Yiddish. Once the German Enlightenment arrived in Russia in the mid-19th century it caused an immediate split among the Jews there into two groups: the Halachic Jews rejected the Enlightenment in favor of the Law and the old ways, which meant, of course, a continuing refusal to assimilate; the Maskilic Jews accepted the Enlightenment, but in accepting it, they began, far more than those following the old way, to look for the messiah in political movements, movements which invariably came from German Jews or conversos like Ferdinand Lassalle and Karl Marx. As a result, Russia's Jews were awakened from the slumber of the shtetl by Moses Mendelssohn, but they did not follow Mendelssohn's example. Instead they became progressively more radicalized during the 19th century, until the German Enlightenment culminated in Bolshevism, which, according to Nora Levin, "attracted marginal Jews, poised between two worlds—the Jewish and the Gentile—who created a new homeland for themselves, a community of ideologists bent on remaking the world in their own image."[10]

Masonic convergence was in the air. While Jews like Maimon and Mendelssohn were proclaiming their willingness to abandon the shtetl and the "darkness" of the Talmud and the Kahal, Prussians were abandoning historical Christianity in favor of something more "German." Enlightened Christians like Christian von Dohm wrote his treatise *On the Civic Improvement of Jews*, calling for their political emancipation. The message of the German Enlightenment was that talent was more important than religion or ethnicity. Caspar Lavater tried to convert Mendelssohn to Christianity but failed because he failed to gain the support of people like Goethe, who announced that he was not a Christian either. The Enlightenment thus led to the idea of the genius as the secular alternative to the saint. It led as well to the idea of the intellectual elite as the secular clerisy, and to literary cults of personality, like the one the German Jews created around Goethe, who found that "Jewish women possess[ed] the gift of being the most sensitive audience."[11]

Conversion was still necessary for Jews, but now instead of baptism, the Enlightenment proposed a new alternative. Jews now had to convert to German *Kultur* and German *Bildung*, as defined by Goethe. In the aftermath of Lavater's attempt to convert him to Christianity, Mendelssohn wrote *Jerusalem or Upon Ecclesiastic Power and Judaism* (1783), in which, he claimed—contrary to what Maimon and everyone else knew of the Talmud and the religious establishment based on it—that Judaism was compatible with the ideas of the Enlightenment. In this regard, Mendelssohn was only

doing for Judaism what Immanuel Kant in his *Religion within the Bounds of Reason* was doing for Christianity.

As a result a certain Masonic convergence was inevitable. Over the course of the 19th century, the ground of that convergence would become Germany and not freemasonry. Jews and Germans were in the process of defining themselves as a cultural community in which religion had ceased to be important. Heinrich Heine would claim that Mendelssohn had done to the Kahal and the Talmud what Luther had done to the Catholic Church, and once again it seemed that Jews and Judaizers—as the Hussites, Calvinists, and Puritans had done before them—would find common ground for a new "reformed" religion in their hatred of the Catholic Church.

The 'Church' of this new cult was the Masonic lodge, but as in France, the lodge spawned clubs which allowed not only diverse religions but both sexes to meet on common ground. The salons of Berlin allowed Jews and Christians to mix socially. Unlike the lodge, the salons admitted and were often run by women. The common denominator of the salons was Enlightened German culture. Both Jews and Christians were abandoning historical religion in favor of something that was more German and Masonic. Romance accelerated the process. Graetz was upset at the free love: "If the enemies of the Jews had designed to break the power of Israel, they could have discovered no more effectual means than infecting Jewish women with the moral depravity, a plan more efficacious than that employed by the Midianites, who weakened the men by immorality."[12] Elon claims that the salons constituted "a kind of freemasonry. . . of the heart, and a safe haven for nonconformists."[13]

Along with the daughters of Moses Mendelssohn, some of whom married Christians, one of the habitué of the Berlin salons was David Friedlaender, the Jew who created Reform Judaism after imbibing deeply of the sexualized Masonry that filled the air there. Elon claims that "Mendelssohn became the father, albeit inadvertently, of modern Reform Judaism" although "he himself remained traditionally devout and observant throughout his life."[14] If Mendelssohn was the Christ of reformed Judaism, David Friedlaender was its St. Paul. If Mendelssohn was the Moses of Jewish assimilationism, David Friedlaender was its Joshua.

In 1799 Friedlaender and other Jews faced a crisis. Because the Enlightenment had demonstrated the "darkness" of the Talmud, the Jews in Germany were involved in a massive conversion to "enlightened" Christianity. According to Graetz, half of Berlin's Jews converted to Christianity during this period. The Jews of Koenigsberg, Immanuel Kant's home town, were on the verge of disappearing completely. Four of Moses Mendelssohn's daughters converted to Christianity, as did his famous composer grandson Felix. Dorothea Mendelssohn even went so far as to convert to Catholicism when her erstwhile Protestant husband Heinrich Schlegel did.

faced with the greatest wave of conversions in Europe since the conversions in Spain during the first half of the 15th century, David Friedlaender decided to make an explicit proposal based on the implicit assumptions he had imbibed in Berlin's salons. Friedlaender argued for a "dry baptism"[15] in the spirit of Masonic convergence. Jews would enter the Lutheran Church if they could do so without recognizing the divinity of Christ. It seemed a plausible solution since the Lutherans were on their way to abandoning historical Christianity as avidly as the Jews were abandoning the Talmud and Kahal. Liberal theologians had already omitted mention of the Trinity and other inconvenient Christian dogmas in their new catechisms, but Friedlaender carried the idea by formulating it so boldly.

The Masonic convergence which the Enlightened imbibed in Berlin's salons apparently could only utter its name within the protected confines of the lodge. Under the influence of the Masonic Enlightenment, Judaism was becoming less Jewish, and Lutheranism was becoming less Christian. Both were becoming German instead. Once the idea was broached outside the hothouse atmosphere of the Lodge or salon, however, it brought down upon Friedlaender's head a torrent of abuse and denunciations from both sides. Progressive Jews like Heinrich Graetz found the idea appalling. Even progressive theologians like Friedrich Schleiermacher, who had met Friedlaender at Henriette Herz's salon, denounced the idea as insidious Christianizing.

The violence of the reaction to Friedlaender's reading of what were simply the Masonic commonplaces of salon discourse showed just how out of touch the intellectual life of those salons was with the real world. The real world, in this instance, went by the name of Napoleon. Rahel Levin was a famous Jewish bluestocking who longed for a mystical convergence of Jew and Christian in the Enlightened Germany of the Berlin salons. Her dream ended in 1806 when Prussia was defeated by France and Napoleon rode into Jena under Hegel's admiring gaze like the *Zeitgeist* on horseback. Left high and dry after the tide of Enlightenment free love and Masonic syncretism flowed out of Prussia in the wake of Napoleon's arrival, all Rahel Levin could do was bemoan a world now irretrievably lost: the dream of Masonic convergence between Enlightened Christians and Jews "sank in 1806. Sank like a ship, carrying the most beautiful gifts, the most beautiful pleasures of life."[16]

Napoleon's conquest of the German principalities imposed the Enlightenment by force on the German people. When Napoleon was defeated, his defeat created the German reaction to the Enlightenment which has come to be known as Romanticism. The Germans found things dark, Catholic, and medieval an attractive alternative to the social geometry of the French Revolution.

The Jews were the first to suffer during the reaction. Beginning in August 1819 in the Bavarian city of Wuerzburg, anti-Jewish riots swept through

German Cities. The rallying cry of the rioters was "*Hep, Hep, Jude verreck*!" In the word "Hep," an acronym for the Latin phrase, "*Hierosolyma est perdita,*" or "Jerusalem is lost," the past which the Enlightenment had repressed was back with all its former virulence. The Germans who used the phrase during the pogroms along the Rhine at the time of the crusades are said to have gotten it from the Roman soldiers who used it as their battle cry during the siege and destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem in 70 AD. The Middle Ages had returned with a vengeance. Or so it seemed to the disillusioned Jews who saw in Christianity and the Catholic Church the source of all Jewish woe. Rahel Levin blamed the Romantics and "their newfound hypocritical love for Christianity. . . and the Middle Ages, with its poetry, art and atrocities, [which] incites the people to commit the only atrocity that they may be still provoked to: attacking the Jews!"[17] In reality, the Hep Hep riots were only the beginning of an increasingly violent anti-revolutionary reaction which would culminate in the most violent counter-revolutionary reaction of all, the Nazi reaction to Bolshevism. Napoleon, according to Chaim Potok, "invaded Russia in June 1812 with an army of five hundred thousand men. Ecstatic eastern European Jews hailed him as the messiah, hung his portrait on the walls of their homes, and helped provision his armies."[18] Revolution was synonymous in the minds of Germans with the Jews. When Napoleon, the "Jewish" messiah, withdrew in defeat, the Jews had to pay the price for supporting him. In Rome, the pope made Jews put on their yellow badges again. In Frankfurt the medieval laws restricting the rights of Jews were reinstated. In general the states which had passed emancipation edicts at Napoleon's command rescinded them when he was defeated.

Elon claims that "the new nationalism harkened back to the Middle Ages, its sacred union of church, people and state."[19] The Middle Ages, according to this view, was a time when Germans "worshipped homogeneity and appealed to tribal instincts."[20] Elon ignores the fact that the Middle Ages was a time completely devoid of racial thinking. Even as late as the Reuchlin/Pfefferkorn controversy, "*die Dunkelmaenner*" from Cologne, the Dominicans, took a completely antiracial line, as opposed to humanists like Erasmus, who felt that Pfefferkorn retained some ineradicable biological Jewishness. In looking for villains, Elon can't bring himself to understand that the idea of race was new. It could not be a throwback to the Middle Ages because it didn't exist in the Middle Ages. After the defeat of Napoleon, the idea of race began to supplant the Masonic ideal of Lessing's *Nathan* as both its logical conclusion and its antithesis. It was an instance of Hegel's oft-cited concept of "*Aufhebung*"; race abolished the Enlightenment by exalting it to a new level. The glorification of race was the logical outcome of the simultaneous conversion to "*Kultur*" and "*Bildung*" taking place among progressive Lutherans and Jews under the influence of the Enlightenment. Because of the Enlightenment, German culture had replaced religion as the criterion of citizenship. The Enlightenment

endured as long as no one looked into the basis of culture, which was a combination of religion and place. The trauma of Napoleonic conquest ended that naïve idyll, evoking a violent reaction that according to the cunning of history would insure a return to the symbols of the Middle Ages but not to the cult which was the inspiration of those symbols. Romanticism meant both a return to Catholicism and the exaltation of local culture, but the analytic spirit set loose by revolution eventually dissolved the Romantic synthesis into biology and race. Once that analysis began—largely as a result of the defeat of Napoleon—German *Kultur* disintegrated too and the Enlightenment synthesis which Lessing proposed in his play was over, no matter how much it would be kept on artificial life support in institutions dominated by Enlightenment thought. If Romanticism had brought about a deep-rooted return to the Catholic soul of the Middle Ages, it could not have prevented an anti-Jewish reaction to the excesses of the Revolution, but it would have promoted the antithesis of racism.

Racism's emergence from the ruins of the Enlightenment meant paradoxically that there was still life left in that movement. Revolution did not cease to exist with the defeat of Napoleon's empire; it became nationalist in its orientation instead, culminating in what would have seemed like a contradiction in terms to Mendelssohn, namely, Jewish nationalism or Zionism, which reared its ugly head in 1862 with the publication of Moses Hess's tract *Rom und Jerusalem*. The idolatry of race continued the abandonment of religion which the philosophes of the Enlightenment had begun. As Jews became less Jewish and Christians less Christian, their only common meeting ground was the Masonic dream of Lessing's Nathan. When Napoleon destroyed that vision of German culture, Germans could return to the universalism of Catholicism or move on to the new religion of race and nation. Residual Protestant animus insured that the latter would be the case. It also ensured that in the reaction to Napoleon, German culture began to be defined in increasingly racial terms. Johann Gottlieb Fichte in his address to the German nation urged not the conversion of the Jews but their deportation to the Middle East, an idea that Theodor Herzl, another devotee of German culture, would find congenial at the end of the century. In spite of the turn toward race, Germany would remain the center of Jewish thought for the rest of the century, and, what is more important, it would become a model for the benighted *Ostjuden* of the shtetls, who would become the cutting edge of the revolutionary movement when Mendelssohn's ideas swept through the Pale of the Settlement in the mid-nineteenth century.

THE PARTITION OF POLAND

The Jewish longing for liberation from the Kahal and the tyranny of the rabbis became more than just a theoretical possibility for literary figures like Mendelssohn and Maimon primarily because of the partition of Poland, which took place in three separate events beginning in 1772 and ending in 1795. When it began, 85 percent of the world's Jews lived in Poland. When it ended 50 percent of the world's Jews lived in Russia, along the porous western border in a section that came to be known as the Pale of the Settlement.

Not long after the partition of Poland, Russia became aware that it had a Jewish problem. It had inherited its new Jewish problem from the Polish nobility who had used the Jews to do what they had no desire to do themselves. With the exception of tax-farming, all of the practices which had led to the Chmielnicki pogroms and the ultimate demise of Poland were still in place, now practiced by an unassimilated minority on Russia's crucial border with the West. Around the time that David Friedlaender made his proposal for "dry baptism" to the German Lutherans, the Czar appointed one of his most distinguished civil servants, the poet Gavriil Romanovich Dershavin, to go on a fact-finding mission to the Pale of the Settlement and find out why the peasants from the greatest grain producing region in Europe were starving to death. In 1802 Dershavin issued his report. After traveling extensively in the grain producing areas of western Russia, Dershavin discovered that the Jewish vodka producers were exploiting the alcoholism of the farmers: "After I had learned that the Jews out of greed were exploiting the drinking problems of the peasants to cheat them out of their grain, in order to turn that grain into vodka, and as a result were causing famine, I ordered the distilleries in the village of Liosno shut down." "I also made enquiries among the reasonable inhabitants," as well as among the aristocracy, the merchants and the people living in the village "concerning the mores of the Jews, their business practices, their scams and all of the tricks they used to. . .drive the stupid and penniless inhabitants of the village to the brink of starvation. I was especially interested in how it might be possible to protect these poor devils and to enable them to live an honest and not disastrous life. . . to make them useful citizens."[21]

Dershavin discovered that the majority of the Jews made their living from distilling and selling vodka. Jews were no longer tax farmers, but they had a monopoly on alcohol production which when combined with usury was causing drunkenness and famine among the peasants. The Jewish vodka dealers had the habit of showing up with their wares at harvest time and selling alcohol to the farmers on credit. The drinking habits of the peasants combined with the inexorable nature of compound interest led to a situation in which not only every bit of property was in the hands of the Jews but future harvests as well. According to a report from the Administration of Belarus, "The presence of Jews in the villages has a destructive effect on the economic

and moral situation of the rural population because Jews . . . promoted drunkenness among locals."[23]

In other administrative reports, the same story emerged: "the Jews were the main cause of leading the peasants into drunkenness, laziness, and poverty, largely because of the fact that they were willing to sell them vodka on credit (i.e. let them pawn their goods to get vodka). The production of spirits was an irresistible source of income for both the Polish magnates and the Jewish middlemen."[24] "The Jews not only cheated the peasants out of the grain they needed to live on, they also cheated them out of their seed corn, their farming implements, household items, time, health and life." "The Jews made a practice of traveling around in the fall during the harvest, getting not only the peasants but their entire families drunk, then getting them in debt, then robbing them of every last thing they needed to keep themselves alive." "By cheating the drunken peasants and plundering them of their goods, the Jews plunged the inhabitants of the villages into deepest misery."[24] The Jews became an active, irreplaceable and extremely inventive link in the chain of exploitation that plagued the illiterate, defenseless peasants without any rights. If it weren't for the Jews this system of exploitation would have had no foundation in the Byelorussian settlements. "Removing the Jewish link," the Byelorussian report concluded, was the only way to break the chain of exploitation that held the farming class in alcohol-and usury-induced bondage.

Dershavin felt that the heart of the problem lay with the Kahal, the autonomous Jewish legal system, as well as the rabbinic Jewish leadership, which was determined to keep the Jews themselves subservient and isolated. "The teachers of the Jewish race" according to Dershavin, "distorted the true spirit of the Faith with their 'mystic-talmudic' pseudo-exegesis of the Bible. . . They introduced strict laws with the goal of isolating the Jews from the other nations, and to awaken in the Jews a deep hatred against other religions." The main problem was the talmudic Jewish religion, which "instead of cultivating communal virtue. . . turned worship into an empty ceremony."[25]

The solution was education, especially in modern languages, because the ability of Jews to speak to fellow Russians would break the hold of the Kahal by ending the isolation of the Jews. Dershavin was hardly an obscurantist. In any other country—in America for instance, which would not see an educational reformer like this until the end of the same century, he would have been hailed as another Horace Mann or John Dewey. "Any Jewish reform in Russia," he continued, "must begin with the founding of public schools, in which the Russian, the German, and the Yiddish languages are taught." Dershavin was uncompromising in calling for the abolition of the Kahal, but so were many Jews. The Kahal was evil in his eyes because through it the simple Jewish people "are deceived into believing that between them and those of other faiths an impenetrable wall has come into existence." As a result, "the darkness which surrounds all Jews keeps them separated from their

fellow citizens."[26] The Talmud schools were the main vehicle for the perduring and pernicious messianism which enslaved the Jewish people. In the Talmud schools, the Jewish people were kept in constant anticipation of the messiah. They were also taught to believe that their messiah by overthrowing all other races would "reign over them in flesh and blood, and will restore to them their fame and glory."

Dershavin concluded that the main reason for the shortage of grain in White Russia and the Ukraine was the Jews' exploitation of the peasants. As a result of writing his report, Dershavin was demonized as an anti-Semite. Because of his observations in Byelorussia, because of the conclusions he drew in his Memorandum, but especially because he praised "the sharp eye of the great Russian monarchs" which "prohibited the immigration of these clever thieves into their kingdom," Dershavin was demonized as "a fanatical foe of the Jews."[27] Far from preaching racial hatred, Dershavin, like Catherine the Great, thought he could reform the Jews by reorienting them toward productive activity. In dealing with what he saw as the Jewish penchant to cheat people of other races, Dershavin tried to distinguish between freedom of religious conscience and "impunity for criminal behavior," and this involved a two-pronged attack on the problem. First of all, the Kahal was to be abolished along with "a ban on all previous involvement with usury."[28] At the same time, Dershavin suggested that Jews should be given access to the university, where they could become doctors and professors.

The Jews retaliated by bringing false charges against Dershavin. A Jewish woman from Liosno claimed that Dershavin beat her with a club while visiting a vodka distillery there, causing her to have a miscarriage. In response to an investigation into the charges conducted by the Russian Senate, Dershavin answered: "Since I only spent 15 minutes in this factory, I not only did not beat the Jewish lady in question, I didn't even see any Jewish women."[29] After an audience with the Czar, the Jew who had written the lying charges for his wife was sentenced to a year in prison, but was released after two or three months largely because of Dershavin's efforts. Unfortunately, the Czar was murdered in May 1801 before having a chance to act on the recommendations in Derhavin's memorandum.

Gradually, Dershavin lost his influence with the new Czar, largely as a result of political intrigue. Eighteen months after the death of Czar Paul, toward the end of 1802, a "Committee for the Assimilation of the Jews" was finally created to consider Dershavin's Memorandum and to take corresponding steps. The big issue remained alcohol. The Jews lived in the same villages with the peasants and their prosperity was based on the exploitation of their neighbors' weakness. In order to insure that the Committee's efforts came to nothing, the Jews raised a million rubles to bribe public officials. The main goal of the Jews' bribery was to discredit Dershavin as an anti-Semite and drive him from

office. If that failed, the money was to ensure that the production and sale of alcohol remained in the hands of the Jews.

By the time the committee held its first meeting, Jewish money had done its work. In spite of the warnings Dershavin had sent to the new Czar, Count Speransky "was completely on the side of the Jews." Furthermore, "during the first meeting of the Jewish committee it became clear that all of the committee members shared the opinion that the right to sell vodka. . .should remain as in the past in Jewish hands." Dershavin's efforts eventually paid off in spite of the machinations of the Jews. The law which was passed in 1804 specified that "No Jew . . . is allowed to sell vodka or to subcontract the sale of vodka."[30]

It might be more accurate to say that Dershavin's efforts paid off in the short run. With the money they had made from vodka production, the Jews continued to manipulate public opinion, portraying the prohibition of the sale of vodka and the order to move out of the villages as a terrible injustice.[31] Reacting to the incessant pressure of the Jews and the bribery of public officials that went along with it, Alexander I revoked the order banning the sale of alcohol. By now the figure of Napoleon loomed large in Russian life. Napoleon had set his sights on the east and had begun a propaganda campaign, originally conceived in his campaign in Palestine against the Turks, to portray himself as the spirit of Revolution incarnate and, as a result, the Jewish messiah. Napoleon knew that he needed Jewish support to conquer Russia, and Alexander I knew that he knew that, and so the Czar was reluctant to alienate what was already perceived as a potential fifth column on his western border. In 1806 Alexander I convened another committee to decide whether the Jews should be resettled. In the end, the arrival of Napoleon convinced him to abandon both projects. Military necessity made the decision moot.

Chaim Potok claims that Jews welcomed Napoleon as the messiah. Solschenizyn, however, claims that the Jews remained loyal to the Czar after the war with Napoleon began. Looking back at the Napoleonic era, Nicholas I wrote in his diary "It's amazing how faithful the Jews remained to us, even risking their lives to help us."[32] During the war the Jews were the only ethnic group in Russia which didn't flee into the forests to escape from the French army. However, in the area around Vilna, the Jews who refused induction into the French army could not resist the temptation to profit from the situation financially by provisioning the French army.

No matter how the Jews reacted, the threat of Napoleon coupled with the bribery of the Jews derailed Russia's first attempt to deal with its newfound Jewish problem. After 1814, the problem was compounded by the fact that central Poland became part of the Russian empire, adding another 400,000 Jews to the already large and unassimilated group living in the Pale of the Settlement. As a result, the Jewish problem in Russia became even more pressing and even more difficult to solve.

After the plan to ban Jews from the alcohol industry failed, Russia's next attempt to solve the Jewish problem involved resettling Jews on plots of land in New Russia on the steppes north of the Black Sea and training them to be farmers. The program exuded an almost American optimism about human nature along with a Jeffersonian view of the salutary nature of agriculture in an Enlightened culture. Russia, perhaps influenced by the success of the American Enlightenment, felt that it could turn saloon keeping usurers into sturdy yeomen farmers within a generation, but the program soon made contact with deeper more intractable realities, most notably, the Jewish aversion to manual labor. P. I. Pestel was convinced that this early example of social engineering was a fool's errand because, quite simply, Jews do not believe in farming. "In expectation of the messiah," Pestel wrote, "the Jews considered themselves only temporary inhabitants of the land in which they live, and as a result want to have nothing to do with agriculture. They also hold all forms of labor in contempt and devote themselves almost exclusively to trade."[33] Farming involves lots of hard work. It is also something, Solschenizyn points out, that can only be learned over the course of a number of generations and can't be forced on people against their will.

Before long, it became clear that getting Jews involved in agriculture was a hopeless cause.[34] By 1810-12, in spite of significant government promotion of the program, the Jewish colonies in the south continued to languish, because Jews were not accustomed to getting up early in the morning, nor were they accustomed to working outdoors in the cold. By the time they were ready to plant their crops, the season was so far advanced that frost would kill the plants before they were ripe enough to harvest. "The Jews waited until it was warm to sow their seed and by then it was too late." In addition, "Farm implements were either lost, broken or destroyed by the Jews," and the oxen which were needed to pull the plow were slaughtered, or stolen or sold. According to M. O. Gerschenson, "The spirit of the Jewish people prohibits involvement in farming because a man who tills the soil is the man most likely to put down roots in a particular place." Jews gave up the plow at the first opportunity to become middlemen and devote themselves to other more desirable activity. The hard work of farming was the bitter lot of the *goyim*;[35] the fact that Jews did not have to break their backs while engaging in hard physical labor was perhaps taken as another sign that they were the Chosen People. Jewish women soon refused to marry farmers, or they had clauses added to their marriage contracts which specified that they could not be expected to do manual farm labor.[36] Finally in 1811, in a tacit admission of failure, the government allowed the Jews of the Pale of the Settlement to get back into the vodka business, and that cooled whatever interest they had in turning Jews into farmers.[37]

Before long, government officials discovered that the Jewish unwillingness to work the land did not preclude a desire to take possession of the land and

have other people work it for them. Thus, the government's scheme to use agriculture to solve the Jewish problem compounded the problem by allowing the Jews to become landlords and forcing the peasants who were exploited by them when they were saloon keepers into a new form of bondage as servants and sharecroppers. The laws of Christian countries had always specified that Jews should be prohibited from owning land and having Christian servants. That as many papal fulminations indicated, was flagrantly abused in Poland, but now it was Russia's turn to learn the wisdom behind these papal prohibitions. According to Count Golitsyn, Christians who live in the houses of the Jews, "not only forget the commands of the Christian religion and don't fulfill them, but also take up Jewish customs and practices."[38] The Russians viewed with increasing alarm the rise of judaizing among the Christians of western Russia following the partition. Czar Nicholas later worried that Jews would convert Christians because, beginning in the first half of the 19th century, groups of judaizers spread across Russia. In 1823 the minister for the interior reported on the "wide dissemination" of the heresy of judaizing and estimated at least 200,000 people were involved. A law was passed which forbade Jews to hire Christian servants, specifying that they should hire poor Jews instead, but the law was ignored. As in the case of alcohol production, the law was rescinded quietly after having been ignored. After 1823 Jews were allowed to hire Christian laborers legally. The "strict prohibition" against allowing Christians to work on Jewish farms "was in practice hardly enforced."[39]

Once it became apparent that Jews were not going to become farmers, the Russian government sought a solution to the Jewish problem in education (as Dershavin had suggested), which was seen as the best solution to the isolation which the shtetl imposed on the Jews. The Russian reformers concluded that, in effect, the Jewish people had to be rescued from their own leaders, who exploited the Jews as ruthlessly as the Jews exploited the Russian peasants. The Kahal was the problem. "The Jewish priests, known as rabbis, hold their people in an unbelievable dependence and forbid them in the name of their faith to read any book other than the Talmud. . . . A race that does not seek Enlightenment will always remain a victim of prejudice."[40]

That was the view of a Russian official, but it was shared increasingly by many Jews, who were in many ways the prime victims of the Polish Kahal, which functioned as the supreme judicial authority of what was in effect a state within a state. The Kahal was notorious for its corruption, creating in effect a two-tiered system which ensured that poor Jews would be punished for crimes which the rich Jews could commit with impunity. "The close relations among the Jews enable them to accumulate great sums of money for their general purposes, especially for the purpose of bribing public officials and to introduce all sorts of abuses, which are good for the Jews." Or at least good for certain Jews. The rabbis promoted early marriage because they profited from it financially. There is even evidence from Jewish historians of the Kahal

authorizing murder. As their contribution to the implementation of the Czar's plan to resettle Jews to the farming lands of New Russia, the Kahal urged poor Jews to emigrate, but urged the wealthy Jews to stay where they were, increasing the profit margin of those who ran the system.[41]

The Kahal was opposed to Haskalah, the Jewish Enlightenment, from the moment that rumors of Moses Mendelssohn's ideas began seeping through Russia's porous western border. The Kahal was opposed to Haskalah because it rightly saw it as a threat to its power. "The Kahal did everything within its power to extinguish the smallest spark of Enlightenment."[42] Giller Markevich wrote that the Kahal had to be abolished to save the Jewish people from spiritual and social ruin; the Jews had to be taught languages, which would enable access to factory work, but they also had to be granted the right to conduct commerce throughout the country and the right to have Christian workers. Before long a consensus emerged among progressive Russian officials and Jewish "renegades" that the tyranny of the Kahal had to be broken. The Czarist government was determined to fight against "Jewish isolation" and so promoted Haskalah without understanding that in promoting the Enlightenment that was the antithesis of talmudic obscurantism, misanthropy and ethnocentrism, it unwittingly exposed the Jews of the shtetls to the revolutionary ideas that German Jews had been formulating as their response to the French revolution. In unwittingly introducing the Maskilim to those ideas, the well-meaning Russian officials introduced them to the revolution that would eventually destroy Russia.

GRIGORII ABRAMOVICH PERETTS

On December 14, 1825, a group of young Russian aristocrats who had been infected by freemasonry and revolution orchestrated a coup against Czar Nicholas I. There was a certain irony to it, since the main exposure to these ideas came as a result of Russia's defeat of Napoleon and revolutionary France. The Decembrist Revolt of 1825 was not a popular revolution, nor did the Jews play a major role in its conception or execution. The only Jew (and one of the few civilians) involved in the Decembrist Revolt was Grigorii Abramovich Peretts (1788-1855). Although he joined in with the revolt of the Russian nobles, Peretts came to revolutionary conclusions by other means. He was the first of many intellectual progeny Moses Mendelssohn would spawn among the Jews of the East.

Peretts was, unlike his co-conspirators, a truly Jewish revolutionary. Left to his own devices, Peretts created a secret organization known as the "Society of Peretts" which was typically Jewish in its rules even down to the secret password it had adopted, namely, *Heruth*, the Hebrew word for liberty.[43] The Society of Peretts was also quintessentially Jewish because of its attachment to messianic politics. The political views of the society were divinely inspired

and its agenda divinely ordained because, as Peretts argued, the law of Moses showed that "God favors constitutional government."[44]

On February 21, 1826, Peretts was arrested for his role in the conspiracy and imprisoned in the notorious Peter and Paul Fortress in St. Petersburg. During his interrogation and imprisonment and the long years of exile which followed his trial, Peretts earned his reputation as Russia's first revolutionary Jew. He blazed the path—certainly the path into exile—which many revolutionary Jews would follow after him.

Peretts was a trail-blazer in other ways as well. In him we see the beginning of Haskalah among the Russian Jews. Peretts was the son of a wealthy merchant by the name of Abram Peretts, who had been granted residency rights in St. Petersburg by Catherine II for his service to the crown. The Perettses, along with other privileged Jews in St. Petersburg, became the nucleus of Jewish Enlightenment in Russia. Peretts, in this regard,

> stood at the beginning of a profound socio-cultural process which gave rise to a secularized Jewish intelligentsia. The process was initiated and largely characterized by the Jewish Enlightenment or Haskalah, which originated with Moses Mendelssohn in mid-eighteenth-century Berlin and then was carried to Eastern Europe by its followers—the Maskilim. Born into a family of first generation Russian Maskilim, Peretts was a child of the Haskalah and a prototype of its most radical expression: the secular educated Jewish intellectual, who, alienated from traditional Judaism and isolated from Russian society, sought salvation through revolution.[45]

The Russian Jews began to implement Mendelssohn's ideas by emphasizing culture instead of religion. This meant that Russian Jews should adopt the German concept of *Bildung* and *Kultur* as the basis for internal Jewish reform, but it also meant that, *ad extra*, the Maskilic Jews began to use their position with Russians of influence to argue for emancipation. If the internal course of *Bildung* and *Kultur* as the alternative to the obscurantist Kahal and talmudic rabbis were to succeed, the Jews had to be met half way and treated as fellow Russian citizens.[46]

Before long, the salons of Berlin began appearing in St. Petersburg. In fact, the Peretts household began to hold a salon of its own, one which became a lively meeting place where progressive Russians and Enlightened Jews could meet to discuss the new ideas trickling in from the West. As in Berlin, the salon took on an air of unreality. It was a place where daring ideas could be expressed without fear, but those ideas had no real connection to either political or religious realities in Russia. To begin with, the Jews found the ideas of the Mendelssohnian *Berlinchiki* repugnant and heretical and a threat to the *modus operandi* which had proved so successful in Poland. The rabbis had no desire to allow rich, young upstarts to challenge their hegemony over the benighted

Jewish people. The Kahal was determined to prevent the integration of Jews into Russian society because that system of self-government preserved the power of traditional Jewish elites, who were funded by activities—vodka and usury—from which the majority of the Jews, one way or another, made their livelihoods, no matter how deleterious their effect on Russian fellow citizens. Beyond that, the Enlightenment never really overcame its identity as a foreign imposition among the Russians. The fact that *Aufklaerung* was a German phenomenon, which could be transplanted to Russian soil only with difficulty if at all should have been obvious. The convergence of Protestant and Jew taking place in the salons of Berlin needed German culture as its common denominator. Without German culture as the neutral ground between the confessions, no meeting of the minds was possible. Needless to say, German culture did not exist in Russia. There had been no reformation in Russia. Christendom in Russia had not been split into two branches, with all of the scandal that that split entailed. There had been no consequent intellectual dilution of the faith, and there was no need for a Masonic meta-confessional alternative among the Russian intellectual elites as there was in Germany, which had been divided between Catholic and Protestant denominations for three hundred years.

Failing to find the third way in Russian culture, Peretts exposed both the limitations of Russian Jewish Enlightenment and its origins when he converted to Lutheranism. Lutheranism was beginning a long process of dissolution under the solvent of the historical critical method in Germany, a dissolution which would culminate in the writings of Friedrich Nietzsche, the son of a Lutheran pastor who read the writings of Strauss. If that were the case in Germany, Lutheranism certainly had no future for a converted Jew in orthodox Russia.

As a result, Peretts quickly passed from being an Enlightened Jew to being an Enlightened Protestant. Once those steps had been taken, the distance to Peretts the Jewish revolutionary was not far. Peretts became the model for other revolutionary Jews to follow because of the peculiar circumstances in which the Enlightened Jews found themselves in Russia. The Enlightenment led to hopes for emancipation, but emancipation proved maddeningly elusive. As a result, those who espoused the cause of Enlightenment among the Jews found themselves increasingly isolated, cut off from both Jew and Christian, but still inspired by a vision of Liberty, Fraternity, and Equality that was being implemented elsewhere. Peretts became, as a result, "the archetype of nineteenth-century Russian-Jewish radical whose personality and political engagement were shaped by the modernizing ideology of the Jewish Enlightenment and its unsettling sociological consequences."[47]

The Mendelssohnian Enlightenment which turned Peretts into a revolutionary took root among Russian Jews between the Decembrist uprising of 1825 and Russia's defeat in the Crimea in 1855. During this period,

traditional Talmudic Judaism was largely discredited as obscurantist and obsolete in the eyes of Jewish youth, but assimilation into Russian culture did not follow. As a result, the idea of revolution began to fill the vacuum created by the former yet not filled by the latter. Jewish culture was caught in what looked like a never ending squabble between modernists and traditionalists, and young Jews, seeing no end to the bickering, took matters into their own hands by becoming revolutionaries.

Public education played a major role in this transformation. The revolutionary Jew in Russia is in large measure a product of that country's educational reforms during the 19th century. Convinced that "only the re-education of Jews in Jewish schools—schools based on Haskalah principles and operated with the assistance of enlightened Jews—would lead to their gradual rapprochement [*sblizhenie*] with the Christian population and the eradication of superstitions and harmful prejudices instilled by the study of Torah,"[48] Uvarov succeeded in getting a new law passed establishing special schools for the education of Jewish youth. By the mid-1850s, the Russian government had established a network of Haskalah-based Jewish schools that rivaled the traditional talmudic Yeshivas in their influence over the rising generation of Jews in the Pale of the Settlement. What had been a persecuted minority in the days of Grigorii Peretts was now a powerful intellectual elite in search of a philosophy which would guide them out of the darkness of the Jewish past into the light of a promising but uncertain future. That elite had emancipated itself from the hegemony of the rabbis but had not as yet found a new home for itself in Russian culture. The disappointments which followed that search would lead that new generation of secularly educated Jews into the arms of the revolutionary movement which was then forming in western Europe.

CHRISTIAN JOHANN HEINRICH HEINE

During the summer of 1830 Heinrich Heine was a little-known poet vacationing on the island fortress of Helgoland with a soprano of the Hamburg opera who got a free summer vacation in exchange for serving as his mistress. His summer idyll was interrupted by the arrival of a newspaper announcing that revolution had broken out in France again, and immediately this Jewish convert to Protestantism felt the ancestral call of the race he had abandoned to advance his literary career. "Gone is my longing for peace and quiet," Heine wrote a few days later, "Once again I know what I want, what I ought, what I must do . . . I am a son of the revolution and will take up arms."[49] Almost before putting the newspaper down, Heine decided that he had to go to Paris to be part of the revolution.

Heine had grown up in Duesseldorf when that German city was a French arrondissement as a result of Napoleon's conquests. Heine watched French

soldiers march into his home town as a young boy and remained a devoted follower of Napoleon for his entire life. If Napoleon was the messiah of the religion of revolution, Napoleon was also "the Moses of the French who like the latter has led the people through the desert in order to cure them."[50]

He was also the god that had failed. Napoleon's defeat had put an end to Jewish emancipation and plunged Jewish youth into utter disillusionment and despair, at least in 1814. In 1830, Napoleon was long dead, but it looked as if the spirit of revolution had returned. It was the converso Heine who created the legend of Napoleon, the man who had unified Europe under the banner of revolution, to keep the idea of revolution alive, and his legend inspired generations of Jews from that time on. Heine felt that the "task of our time" was "emancipation. . . .Not just of the Irish, the Greeks, the Frankfurt Jews, the West Indian blacks, and other oppressed people. It is the emancipation of the entire world, of Europe in particular. It has come of age and now tears itself loose from the iron reins of the privileged and the aristocracy."[51]

Heine was dismissed by many Germans as the quintessential rootless cosmopolitan Jew. Both Heine and his friend Ludwig Boerne were "born provocateurs, *ewige Ruhestoerer*, arousers, intellectual troublemakers. Both were at home first and foremost in the language. Their rootlessness provided a kind of Archimedian vantage point from which they assessed the world with greater freedom, wit and acuity than others could. With Heine and Boerne, a new kind of engaged liberal intellect, soon decried as typically Jewish entered German life." According to Elon, "Both were baptized but remained Jews psychologically. Both were liberal polemicists, their recurrent theme liberty."[52] According to Heinrich von Treitschke: "With Boerne and Heine the eruption of the Jews into German literary history began, an ugly and infertile interlude."[53]

Heine wasn't a Jew, unless race trumped religion. He was a converso, a Jew who converted into an insincere Christian for apparently opportunistic reasons. Heine became famous for saying that the baptismal certificate was "the entrance ticket to European culture."[54] His cynical manipulation of the sacrament showed that religion was not something his age took as seriously as race, and his baptism of convenience ensured the rise of racial consciousness as well, a rise he knew would not bode well for Jews.

Heine converted to Christianity, but his hoped-for position never materialized, and so he lived off his rich uncle Salomon from Hamburg. The conversion to Christianity didn't do much for Heine's morals. He contracted syphilis in his youth and died of the malady in 1856. When he was 18, Robert Schumann met Heine in Munich in 1828 and was struck by his "bitter ironic smile."[55] Schumann, who set many of Heine's poems to music, also died of syphilis. The "bitter ironic smile" was to become Heine's trademark and a characteristic of the Jewish revolutionary manqué who turned to literature as a way of pursuing the revolution by other means.

As the revolution of 1830 continued to spread, Heine joined Boerne in Paris. Heine met Boerne in 1827. Boerne was a Jew who had converted to Christianity in 1813. Both became disillusioned with politics after the revolution of 1830 failed to spread to Germany. Unlike Boerne, whose conversion may have been sincere, Heine found his voice as the rootless cosmopolitan. After the failure of the revolution of 1830, Heine briefly contemplated joining Boerne in Switzerland as co-editor of a new magazine, but the *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung* offered him its job as its Paris correspondent. Heine was only too happy to accept the offer, because by then he had fallen in love with Paris, where he felt "like a fish in water" or like, more tellingly, like "Tannhaeuser imprisoned in the Venusberg."[56]

In 1835, Heine's works were banned in Germany and his return was therefore made impossible. To console himself for the loss of a country, Heine went on to make the acquaintance of the leading literary and revolutionary figures in the French capital. It was there that he met Marx and Engels. There he also met Ferdinand Lassalle, with whom he corresponded on a number of subjects including the music of Felix Mendelssohn, a talented Jew (Heine ignored Mendelssohn's conversion almost as much as he ignored his own) who wasted his talent, in Heine's view, on Christian themes. "I cannot forgive this man of independent means," Heine wrote to Ferdinand Lassalle in 1846, "because he sees fit to serve the Christian pietists with his great and enormous talent. The more I admire his greatness, the more angry I am to see it so iniquitously misused. If I had the good fortune to be Moses Mendelssohn's grandson, I would not use my talents to set the piss of the Lamb to music."[57]

As a result of his friendship with Marx and Engels and Lassalle, Heine had prophetic things to say about communism. In 1842, he wrote:

> Though communism is at present little talked about, vegetating in forgotten attics on miserable straw pallets, it is nevertheless the dismal hero destined to play a great, if transitory role in the modern tragedy . . . [It will be] the old absolutist tradition. . .but in different clothes and with new slogans and catch-phrases . . . There will then be only one shepherd with an iron crook and one identically shorn, identically bleating human herd . . . Somber times loom ahead . . . I advise our grandchildren to be born with a very thick skin.[58]

Heine soon made a literary name for himself in Paris, where he associated with the leading literary figures of his day, Victor Hugo, Honore Balzac, Alexander Dumas, Alphonse de Lamartine, Alfred de Musset and George Sand. His poetry came out in French. He was patronized by wealthy Jews like Baron James de Rothschild, but that didn't stop him from writing poetry that appealed to the communists. His poem on the impoverished weavers of Silesia found sympathy among the communists. Friedrich Engels translated "The Weavers" into English, and in the 20th century it became the name of a folk

singing act in America of communist persuasion. Treitschke, speaking from the point of view which had banned Heine's poems in Germany, claimed that he possessed "the graceful vice of making the mean and loathsome attractive for a moment."[59]

Even though Heine became famous in France, he never became a French citizen, although he married a French Catholic. He became instead the alienated cosmopolitan, the German poet of *Heimweh* in exile, and a model for European Jews who had tired of imitating Mendelssohn. Metternich admired Heine as "the best mind among the conspirators," which led Metternich to orchestrate the banning of his writings in Germany, an act which confirmed the German Jews in their cosmopolitanism.

Paul Johnson, following Metternich's lead, saw Heine as the quintessential subversive Jew. "It was as though," Johnson wrote, "a superfine talent had been building up in the ghetto over many secret generations, acquiring an ever more powerful genetic coding, and then had suddenly emerged to find the German language of the early nineteenth century its perfect instrument."[60] Heine invented the literary essay, the feuilleton, as a genre and with it the *persona* of the cosmopolitan literary man, the man with no allegiance to anything discernible, who could deflate every pretense with his penetrating wit. Heine was thus "both the prototype and the archetype of a new figure in European literature: the Jewish radical man of letters, using his skill, reputation and popularity to undermine the intellectual self-confidence of established order."[61]

Heine's uncle died in 1844 and left him a small pension, but unfortunately his health gave out at the same time. Engels saw Heine in January 1848 and wrote that "*Heine is am Kaputgehen*. I was with him two weeks ago when he was lying in bed after an attack of nerves (*einen Nervenanfall*). Yesterday he was up and about but still miserable. He can hardly take three steps on his own, creeping along the wall supporting himself from the easy chair to the bed and back again." Elon writes that "Heine's last several years were spent in the throes and excruciating pain of a viral disease that paralyzed half his body and severely affected his vision."[62]

Other biographers were less evasive, claiming that "After 1844 Heine suffered financial reversals and painful physical deterioration from syphilis, the disease which also afflicted Schumann. He spent the last several years of his life in his 'mattress-grave' in a Paris apartment."[63] During his later years, his followers saw in him a Christ-like figure, which had more to do with his doleful appearance than his morals. When asked about preparing his soul for the next life, Heine responded, "If I could walk with crutches I'd go to church, and if I could walk without I'd go to the whorehouse."[64] Heine was not a Jew, because of his baptism, but it is not clear he was a sincere Christian either. In attempting to pinpoint his real identity, Elon claims that Heine "remained loyal to his Jewish heritage only. . . out of deep antipathy to Christianity."

And yet Heine saw that Europe without Christianity was going to be a much different place, which would be much more dangerous for Jews. Heine's prophetic verdict on the Germany of the future is never quoted because it lays the blame for Jewish suffering on neopaganism and not the Catholic Church, but it is worth citing, if as nothing else than his epitaph, and in some sense the final monument to his work as a subversive Jew:

> A drama will be enacted in Germany compared to which the French Revolution will seem like a harmless idyll. Christianity restrained the martial ardor of the Germans for a while but it did not destroy it; once the restraining talisman is shattered, savagery will rise again,. . .the mad fury of the berserk, of which Nordic poets sing and speak. . .The old stony gods will rise from the rubble and rub the thousand-year-old dust from their eyes. Thor with the giant hammer will come forth and smash the gothic domes.[65]

KARL MARX

Karl Marx met Heine shortly after his arrival in Paris in 1843. Marx had been living in Cologne, where he had been the youthful editor of the socialist *Rheinische Zeitung*. When the Prussian government closed the paper down, Marx emigrated to Paris, where he met up with the paper's founder, Moritz Hess, who took him on a tour of the working class districts of Paris and their revolutionary cafes. Hess, who would later change his name to Moses, was an early admirer of Marx. One year before Marx's arrival in Paris, Hess wrote to the German Jewish novelist Berthold Auerbach, praising him as the great revolutionary genius: "Imagine Rousseau, Voltaire, Holbach, Lessing, Heine, and Hegel all fused in one person. . .and you have Marx."[66]

Marx, a generation Heine's junior, was a German Jew who had been baptized at the age of six in 1824, when Heinrich Marx, his father, led the entire family to the Lutheran baptismal font so that he could advance his career as a jurist in Trier. The conversion to Christianity caused no break in the Marx family. Even after his baptism, Heinrich would take his wife and children to regular Sabbath lunches held at the home of Karl's uncle, who also happened to be the chief rabbi of Trier. The only member of Heinrich Marx's family who seems to have taken religion seriously was Karl, who referred to it as the "opiate of the people" in *Towards a Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right: An Introduction* in 1848.

More than one scholar attributes that phrase to Moses Hess, who associated with both Heine and Marx in Paris but, unlike them, never converted to Christianity. The difference seems to derive from class and social aspiration. Hess was born in 1812, after Heine but before Marx, into a poor Jewish family from Cologne with virtually no prospects for upward mobility. Hess was raised by his grandfather, who taught him Talmudic lore, presumably

in Yiddish because Hess had to teach himself German and then French. What Heine, Marx, and Hess had in common was neither religion, nor race, but the revolutionary spirit, which Hess and Heine saw as Jewish and Marx did not. Hess had been a utopian socialist up to his encounter with Marx, who so impressed him with his intellectual power that Hess was swept for at least 20 years into his intellectual orbit. It demonstrates Marx's intellectual stature (or Hess's intellectual malleability) that their collaboration was not disrupted by Marx's early writings, in particular his essay *The Jewish Question*, which appeared the year Hess welcomed Marx to Paris. Marx's essay has been characterized as anti-Semitic by more than one commentator, but Hess, later lionized as one of the fathers of Zionism, seems not to have noticed or been disturbed by the fact.

Marx wrote that essay in response to Bruno Bauer's claim that "If they wish to become free the Jews should not embrace Christianity, as such, but Christianity in dissolution, religion in dissolution; that its to say, the Enlightenment, criticism and its outcome, a free humanity."[67] Bauer's essentially Masonic critique of religion had been percolating through German society for 60 years, ever since the first performance of *Nathan der Weise*, by the time Marx got around to writing his essay. When Marx got ahold of the idea, it had ceased to represent the current historical options. Materialism, which had spread widely via Spinoza (and to some extent Descartes), had been nurtured by Whig subversives like Toland and Collins to the point where, now that it was finally mature, it turned around and slew its parents. Marx was the genius who made the supercession of the Enlightenment's categories perfectly clear to the remaining devotees of the Enlightenment. Communism, as the ideology of economic materialism was soon to be called, was the new sun which made the candle of the Enlightenment unnecessary. There was no point anymore, Marx makes clear, in talking about the religion of Judaism, as Lessing had done, because Judaism, according to Marx, was not a religion.

Unlike Bauer, Marx makes no attempt to "seek the secret of the Jew in his religion," but rather attempts "to seek the secret of their religion in the real Jew."[68] With that distinction in mind, Marx finds that "the proven basis of Judaism" is "practical need [and] self-interest;" that "the worldly cult of the Jew" is "Huckstering," and that "his worldly god" is money.[69] Once the Jewish religion has been deconstructed into economics, the new definition of the Jew leads to a handy resolution of the Jewish Question. The Jew will be emancipated when everyone else is emancipated from the tyranny of mammon and Jewish huckstering. It is only by destroying "practical Judaism," that "our age would emancipate itself."[70]

Beyond that,

> An organization of society which would abolish the preconditions and thus the very possibility of huckstering, would make the Jew impossible.

> His religious consciousness would evaporate like some insipid vapor in the real, life-giving air of society. . . . We discern in Judaism, therefore, a universal antisocial element of the present time, whose historical development, zealously aided in its harmful aspect by the Jews, has now attained its culminating point, a point at which it must necessarily disintegrate. . . . In the final analysis, the emancipation of the Jews is the emancipation of mankind from Judaism.[71]

During his essay, Marx discovers that a false Jewish emancipation (which is to say one according to the Jewish, i.e., capitalist, perspective) has already been taking place in the wake of the French Revolution as Jews insinuated themselves into positions of economic leadership in what claimed to be Christian countries. All talk about Jewish emancipation is meaningless, because the Jew has already emancipated himself in a Jewish fashion: "The Jew who is merely tolerated in Vienna, for example, determines the fate of the whole Empire by his financial power. . . the audacity of industry mocks the obstinacy of medieval institutions."[72] According to Marx, the main vehicle for Jewish emancipation is turning Christians into Jews through the manipulation of the power of money:

> This is not an isolated instance. The Jew has emancipated himself in a Jewish manner, not only by acquiring the power of money, but also because money has become, through him and also apart from him, a world power, while the practical Jewish spirit has become the practical spirit of the Christian nations. The Jews have emancipated themselves insofar as the Christians have become Jews.[73]

Neither Judaism nor Judaized Christianity are religions. Both are "ideologies," which is to say, rationalizations of economic exploitation, as is the Enlightened freemasonry which claimed to transcend both. Religion, according to Marx, is nothing but a sublimated form of economic interest, and this is nowhere better expressed in religious form than in the "religion" of Judaism or in national form than in the United States of America. As Graetz was to substantiate 20 years later when he wrote about the Puritans in his history of the Jews, the American Yankees are judaizers; they worshipped the god of the Jews, which is money:

> the devout and politically free inhabitant of New England is a kind of Laocoon who makes not the least effort to escape from the serpents which are crushing him. Mammon is his idol which he adores not only with his lips but with the whole force of his body and mind. In his view the world is no more than a Stock Exchange, and he is convinced that he has no other destiny here below than to become richer than his neighbor. Trade has seized upon all his thoughts, and he has no other recreation than to exchange objects. When he travels, he carries, so to speak, his goods and his counter on his back and talks only of interest and profit. . . . In

> North America, indeed, the effective domination of the Christian world by Judaism has come to be manifested in a common and unambiguous form: they preach of the Gospel itself, Christian preaching has become an article of commerce.[74]

Marx is proposing here a dialectic according to which Christianity emerged from Judaism in the time of antiquity and was then reabsorbed by it following the Protestant revolutions of the 16th century, especially those in England, where Marx would do much of his research. So, "From the beginning, the Christian was the theorizing Jew; consequently, the Jew is the practical Christian. And the practical Christian has become a Jew again. . . .Christianity is the sublime thought of Judaism; Judaism is the vulgar practical application of Christianity."[75]

Once upon a time, Jews became Christians, but now the opposite is occurring; Christians are becoming Jews insofar as they are falling to their knees in worshipping "the god of practical need and self-interest," which happens to be money because

> Money is the jealous god of Israel, beside which no other god may exist. Money abases all the gods of mankind and changes them into commodities. Money is the universal and self-sufficient value of all things. It has, therefore, deprived the whole world, both the human world and nature, of their own proper value. Money is the alienated essence of man's work and existence; this essence dominates him and he worships it.[76]

When Marx says that "Christianity issued from Judaism. It has now been re-absorbed into Judaism,"[77] he is referring to the convergence of German and Jew brought about by the Enlightenment and German *Bildung*. Religion has ceased to be an issue. In its place, as we have seen, the German Enlightenment proposed German culture as the religiously neutral meeting ground for Enlightened Christians and Jews, but in the shock which followed Napoleon's conquest and the forced imposition of the tenets of the French Revolution, German culture lost its neutrality and became nationalistic instead. That in turn raised the question of what exactly nationalism was, and now the German principalities, deprived of the religious basis of the state, had to look elsewhere for the principles which united them. The Jews were in exactly the same situation. Deprived of religious unity because Talmudic Judaism had been discredited as superstitious mumbo jumbo, the Jew could assimilate into German culture if he chose by converting or he could look for a principle of Jewish unity elsewhere. Marx proposed one alternative in class. Jews could now become the vanguard of the proletariat, and all the world could unite in the service of that class. Communism would become as a result a potent source of Jewish unity in the aftermath of the Enlightenment's attack on the Talmud.

A few years later, Moses Hess would propose race as the basis of Jewish unity. What both alternatives had in common was their espousal of revolution, which became a significant sign of first German and then eastern European Jews. In claiming that "the chimerical nationality of the Jew is the nationality of the trader, and above all of the financier,"[78] Marx was claiming that all nationality was chimerical, if only because "The god of the Jews has been secularized and has become the god of this world." Insofar as the modern state based its deliberations ultimately on economic considerations, it had become Jewish because "the bill of exchange is the real god of the Jew." In countries like this, the legal profession became a form of "Jewish Jesuitism, the same practical Jesuitism which Bauer discovers in the Talmud," namely, "the relationship of the world of self-interest to the laws which govern this world, laws which the world devotes its principal arts to circumventing."[79] Marx's analysis was a brilliant explanation of how capitalism was the Jewish religion; what it failed to explain was how revolution was becoming the competing new Jewish religion which would enter into a hundred year struggle with the old.

When the Revolution of 1848 broke out, Marx rushed off to supply the Belgian workers with arms, seeking in his way to bring about "the social emancipation of the Jews" through "the emancipation of society from Judaism." Others began to fear that the exact opposite was happening when they noticed that the revolutionary movement was disproportionately represented by Jews. The Jewish hegemony over Christian Europe which coincided with the rise of capitalism was now being threatened by a new form of Jewish hegemony, that of the Jewish revolutionary.

When word of the Revolution reached Heidelberg in February, Ludwig Bamberger, a native of the Jewish ghetto in Mainz and now in exile, saw in it "a new world being born in one stroke."[80] Bamberger had attended a Catholic gymnasium in Mainz, but "like many other young intellectuals of Jewish origin, he was a free thinker by conviction, a republican and a follower of the early French utopian socialists . . . a son not of the synagogue but of the emancipation."[81] In Mainz, Bamberger, who would become a representative in the new if short-lived revolutionary government, was known as "Red Ludwig," and before long, the non-revolutionary Germans began to notice that "Jews. . . nearly everywhere. . . were naturally among the rebels, and in some cities, among the leaders."[82] Jews were "natural" revolutionaries. In the widely read Jewish magazine *Der Orient*, Adolf Jellinke "urged all young Jews to join the revolution" because "Every Jew is born a soldier of Freedom . . . . His religion teaches him to be free, to pursue equal rights and to defend the oppressed."[83] Elon gives other examples of Jews promoting revolution:

> The leading Jewish family magazine, the *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums*, on March 11 called upon its readers to join this "timely movement sincerely and with all your hearts." The editors of the religiously

> traditional, politically conservative magazine *Der Treue Zionswaechter*, normally eager to please the authorities, found the courage to announce that their fondest dreams were coming true.[84]

After spending 6000 gold francs of his own money (inherited from his father, of course) to buy arms for the workers of Brussels, Marx traveled from Paris to Duesseldorf and then Cologne spreading copies of his recently published *Communist Manifesto* wherever he went, but before long it became obvious that this revolution, far from abolishing the practical Judaism of capitalism, was simply promoting the new Judaism of revolution. The proof was the predominance of Jews in the revolutionary movement. The Germans whose lives had been disrupted by the revolution began to notice that "a disproportionately high number [of the revolutionaries] were young Jews," primarily because "the prospect of equality under the law, separation of church and state, universal suffrage, and freedom from arbitrary rule generated unbridled enthusiasm and support among young men only a generation or two out of the ghetto."[85]

In Frankfurt and Breslau, according to *Der Orient*, Jews were "leaders of the freedom movements or among those who had organized them."[86] The most prominent were Ludwig Bamberger in Mainz, Ferdinand Lassalle in Duesseldorf, Gabriel Riesser in Hamburg, Johan Jacoby in Koeningsberg, Aron Bernstein in Berlin, Herman Jellinek in Vienna, Moritz Harmann in Prague, and Sigismund Asch in Breslau.

Ferdinand Lassalle, a friend of Heine, who dreamed of liberating the Jews in his youth, got his chance when the revolution arrived in Duesseldorf, Heine's home town. Lassalle's efforts would ensure that one of the "best-organized, best-disciplined uprisings. . .took place in Duesseldorf."[87]

Reaction in the form of anti-Semitic riots followed in the wake of the revolution, especially in rural areas, where Jews were perceived as an especially alien element. Before long Christian rulers became convinced that Jews were responsible for starting the Revolution of 1848. Frederick William IV [of Prussia] subscribed to this view, claiming that the revolution was masterminded by "budding South German Robespierres and Jews." Elon dismisses the "myth" that "Jews and other foreign elements" were responsible for the Revolution of 1848, but only after telling us that "hundreds, perhaps thousands . . . [of Jews] participated in the clashes," including "80 percent of all Jewish journalists, doctors, and other professionals." Given evidence like this, it is not surprising then that the "myth" continued to spread in the years following 1848. Again, the evidence comes from Elon himself:

> In his memoirs Gerna Karl von Prittwitz, the officer commanding the Prussian garrison in Berlin, laid the principal blame for the uprising on Jews, rascals and vagabonds. According to the nationalist historian Heinrich Treitschke, the Jews had been the revolution's "Oriental

> cheerleaders." The *Neue Preussische Zeitung* of January 28, 1849, offered to pay a million Gulden to anyone who could produce a "Jewish reactionary." . . . At year's end, even the *London Standard* claimed that "all the mischief now brooding on the continent is done by Jews."[88]

In Berlin, Leopold Zunz was a Jewish revolutionary who described what was happening in specifically biblical terms shot through with the messianic political view which saw revolutionary politics as the fulfillment of biblical promise. Haranguing the Berlin students from the barricades, Zunz portrayed Metternich as Haman and hoped that "perhaps by Purim, Amalek will be beaten."[89] Amalek in this instance was the Prussian king Frederick William IV, but he symbolized (as a Protestant) "the plutocrats and bureaucrats, the black-robed papist diplomats of Metternich" who were going to perish in the bloody conflagration which would inaugurate "a new age of peace and social justice: heaven on earth seemed imminent."[90]

According to Elon, "Zunz's eschatological vision was not an isolated case. All over the country, rabbis in their sermons greeted the revolution as a truly messianic event. . . . 'The savior for whom we have prayed has appeared. The fatherland has given him to us.'" "The messiah is freedom," raved the Jewish magazine *Der Orient*, which praised "the heroic Maccabean battle of our brethren on the barricades of Berlin."[91]

Berthold Auerbach, who became famous as the author of a series of sentimental German novels which glorified the salutary effects of his natal village in the Black Forest on Catholic-Jewish relations, manned the barricades in Vienna with other revolutionary Jews in September of 1848. By that time, however, it was clear that the revolution's days were numbered. Croatian troops loyal to the Austrian emperor set up artillery emplacements around Vienna and began to bombard the city. Soon those troops had routed the revolutionaries from their barricades and began looting the city as their reward. Before long, the Jewish hucksters which Marx had pilloried went into action, after the revolutionaries had been routed, buying back from the Croatians what they had looted at a fraction of its actual cost. In June of 1849, the revolutionary assembly offered the crown to Frederick William of Prussia, who repaid the favor by having his troops drive the assembly from its home in Stuttgart. One more revolution had failed, and Marx fulminated that the only ones who profited were the Jewish hucksters who amassed fortunes by buying back loot from the looters at a discount.

The failure of the Revolution of 1848 affected Hess every bit as deeply as Marx but in a different way. If Marx emerged from the aftermath of the revolution convinced that class warfare was the wave of the future, Hess came to the opposite conclusion, claiming that race was going to fulfill the promise of revolution. Hess broke with Marx after the failure of the Revolution of 1848, but Frankel says that "Hess never severed his links with

German socialism" because "For Hess, socialism and nationalism were always integrally connected—the nation or the proletariat within the nation was the instrument and socialism was the goal."[92]

At moments like this the uncanny similarities between Hess's national socialism (which came to be known as Zionism years after his death) and Hitler's version of national socialism become too numerous to ignore. But more on that later. Hess spent years in revolutionary poverty, years in which he considered migrating to Texas or Palestine, until 1851 when his father died and a small inheritance allowed him to marry Sybil Pritsch (or Plesch), the prostitute who had been his mistress. By 1848, he had abandoned Marx, largely because of the latter's ruthlessness and the constant political infighting necessary to remain abreast of the movement. Hess attached himself to the more moderate theories of Lassalle, whom Marx, referring to Lassalle's hair and dark features, described as "the Jewish Nigger." Frankel characterizes Hess as "a man easily influenced and easily disheartened, a man of sudden enthusiasms, lonely, dependent on others for leadership" who nonetheless "remained true throughout to the broad outlines of his earliest vision—of a monistic and purposeful historical development that would culminate in the ideal egalitarian society."[93]

The discontinuities in Hess's intellectual life are, however, more apparent that the continuities because the man who joined Marx in denouncing Judaism as the worship of money eventually resurrected the same religion as the worship of race. After drifting intellectually like a ship without a rudder for a number of years, Hess suddenly found new inspiration when he read the first volume of Heinrich Graetz's monumental *History of the Jews*. The nation of money-grubbing hucksters took on a hitherto unrecognized nobility in his eyes. Hess read Graetz when nationalistic movements of unification were sweeping through Italy and Germany, and so Hess, disillusioned with Marx's ruthless engine of class warfare, found a more palatable revolutionary alternative in the Jewish nationalism eventually known as Zionism. The work Hess wrote to give simultaneous expression to his conversion to racial thinking and his Jewish roots was *Rom und Jerusalem*. Hess wrote his magnum opus in 1862 while residing in Germany, when a wave of racial feeling was sweeping the German principalities toward unification in 1870 under Prussian hegemony. Hess was a freemason, and during his twenties he identified himself as a German and felt that it was the duty of every Jew to assimilate to German culture. By the 1860s, faced with the rise of German nationalism and the anti-Semitism which had increased with each subsequent revolution, Hess rejected the Masonic ideal of the merger of all religions and put the religion of race in its place. The only thing which remained constant was the Jewish penchant for revolution and the antipathy toward the Catholic Church, which was the other side of the coin.

In returning to his roots, Hess returns to the ancestral Jewish hatred of the Catholic Church:

> Ever since Innocent III conceived of the plan to annihilate morally the Jews who brought the light of Spanish culture into Christendom by forcing them to wear the badge of shame up until the time that a Jewish child was kidnapped from its home under the regime of Cardinal Antonelli, papal Rome has been nothing less than an unconquerable swamp of poison which even our German Christian enemies have decided to drain so that it might die of starvation.[94]

The eternal antipode of the Jewish people is Rome, as in the Rome of the popes, which at that very moment was being besieged by the forces of Italian nationalism. The decline of Rome, which Hess was then witnessing with his own eyes, meant the rise of Jerusalem:

> with the liberation of the eternal city on the Tiber, the emancipation of the eternal city on Mt. Moriah begins. The rebirth of Italy signals the resurrection of Judea. Jerusalem's orphaned children will also be able to take part in the great ethnogenesis which marks the resurrection from the death-like hibernation of the Middle Ages with its evil dreams.[95]

This historic event was intimately bound up with the history of revolution. In fact, it was the culmination of that history. The springtime of race began with the French Revolution; the year 1789 was the vernal equinox of the historical peoples. The Jewish race, largely as a result of Napoleon's efforts, had been liberated by revolution, so that it could now follow its historic calling, namely uniting the world in fraternal harmony by bringing the revolutionary era to its fulfillment:

> the Jewish race is being carried on the floodtide of events; from the ends of the earth their gaze turns toward Jerusalem. With the secure racial instincts of their cultural-historical calling to unite the world and its peoples and to bring them together in fraternal harmony, the Jewish race has preserved its nationality in its religion and now both are united under their eternal creator the All in One, in the ineffable land of their fathers.[96]

An uncanny convergence of opinion emerges. Like Marx, Hess and the Catholic reaction were unanimous in believing that the French Revolution had brought about the hegemony of the Jews in France. But they differed in the value judgment attached to that hegemony. For Marx and the Catholic reaction, the hegemony of the Jews was known as capitalism, and the state of affairs was bad. For Hess, the historical moment offered an unprecedented opportunity for the Jewish people:

> Germany blazed the path of philosophy; the French on the other hand are responsible for the great political social transformation, which goes hand in hand with the progress of the exact sciences. The French showed

> the rest of the world this way through their great Revolution, asking the nations to follow their example.[97]

The Jewish nation could take the lead in revolutionary activity and become in effect the messiah for which it had waited millennia in vain. According to Barbara Tuchman, Hess got the idea from Heinrich Graetz: "The rise of Jewish nationalism became apparent in 1864 when Heinrich Graetz wrote that Jews must become their own messiah."[98]

Suddenly Hess, as he put it in *Rom und Jerusalem*, found himself again in the midst of his people after a 20-year absence:

> The one thought that I tried to suppress in my own breast is there alive in front of me: the idea that my nationality is inseparable from the DNA of my fathers, from the Holy Land and from the eternal city, which is the birthplace of the Faith in the divine unity of life and the future brotherhood of all Men.[99]

For Hess, race was the primary reality. Race is the source of the Jewish faith (and not the other way around), but more importantly it is the source of "the divine unity of life and the future brotherhood of all Men," from which a powerful political movement can emerge to create heaven on earth. Race is the source of family, and it "is out of this invincible source of Jewish family love that the savior of mankind will come."[100] Hess combined Jewish Messianism with the principle of Equality he had learned from the French Revolution and came up with a new racial revolutionary ideal: "Every Jew has the makings of a messiah in him. Every Jewess, a mater dolorosa."[101]

Hess is a racist who feels that religion derives from race. "Judaism is not a passive religion, rather it is an active recognition, which is organically indistinguishable from the Jewish race."[102] Judaism is racial, but it is also revolutionary because race is the logical conclusion of the French Revolution:

> Today's nationalism is nothing more than a journey down the road which the French Revolution opened for all mankind. Ever since their great Revolution during the century past, the French people have been calling on all the peoples of the world for help.[103]

Eight years after the publication of *Rom und Jerusalem*, Wilhelm Marr popularized the term "anti-Semitism" to convey the idea that being Jewish was racial and not religious. Faithfully mirroring the German anti-Semitism which he sensed in the ascendancy, Hess proposes the Jewish version of the same thing. According to Hess, race trumps every other consideration, including baptism. There is no reason for a Jew to deny his Jewishness anymore by succumbing to conversion. Hess launches a vicious attack on assimilation, while conforming in a uncanny way to the rising tide of German racism:

> Because of the anti-Semitism which surrounds him on all sides, the German Jew is always inclined to strip himself of any Jewish characteristics and to

> deny his race. No reform of the Jewish religion is radical enough for these cultured Jews. Not even baptism can save him from the nightmare of German anti-Semitism. The Germans hate Jewish religion less than they hate the Jewish race, less their peculiar faith than their peculiar noses. . . . Black kinky Jewish hair isn't transformed into blonde hair by baptism and it isn't made straight by any comb. The Jewish race is the original race which reproduces itself in its integrity in spite of climatic influences. The Jewish type has remained unchanged over the course of the centuries.[104]

Hess's rejection of baptism would find uncanny fulfillment in the racial policies of Hitler, who felt that Jewishness was biological and therefore ineradicable. He goes to absurd lengths to prove this, citing "Egyptian monuments from a later period [which] depict Jews whose similarities with our contemporaries is striking."[105] The only problem with racial theories in general and this one in particular is that subsequent biology, in particular the Genome project, seems to show that Ashkenazi Jews were not Semites. They have nothing in common genetically with the Semites Moses led out of Egypt.

The main point of the appeal to race is to show that baptism is pointless: "You see, my dear friend, that it is pointless for Jews to get baptized and to deny their heritage by attempting to immerse itself in the great ocean of indogermanic and Mongolian tribes. The Jewish type is ineradicable."[106] Once again, Hess supplies the rationale for Hitler's extermination campaign against the Jews. If the Jewish type is both "ineradicable," which Hess claimed, and bad, which Hitler claimed, then extermination (or at least forced exile) is the only solution to the Jewish problem. Marx's proposal to eliminate Judaism by eliminating capitalism seems humane by comparison. But Hess seems determined to put all of his eggs in the racial basket: The "modern" Jew, who denies his Jewish nationality, is not only an apostate or renegade in the religious sense of he word, he is also "a traitor to his race and his family."[107]

Hess may have started out in biology, but he quickly ended up espousing the "messianic faith" of the revolutionary Jew which got hatched at the foot of the Cross. Indeed, the two components are closely related since race was now offering the Jews a better faith than the one they rejected at the foot of the Cross. The idea first occurred to him when he was a communist:

> This, my friend, was my thinking during the time I was working for the benefit of the European proletariat. My messianic faith was then what it is today, faith in the rebirth of the world historical cultural races by raising up what had sunken so low to the level of that which has been exalted. Today, as when I first started publishing, I still believe that Christianity was a big step on the way to a noble goal, one which the prophets had called the messianic period. Today, as then, I still believe, that this period of world history began to emerge in the mind of humanity with Spinoza. But I never believed, nor did I ever say that Christianity would have the

> last word in mankind's salvation history, or that Spinoza was the endpoint of that history. What is certain, and what I have never doubted, is that today we are longing for a much broader salvation than Christianity has ever, or could ever, offer. Christianity was the evening star, which rose to give consolation to the nations for the eclipse of antiquity.[108]

As proof that Israel's historical moment has arrived, Hess sites the fact that the papal states are on their last legs. "The Italian nation has risen up from the ruins of Christian Rome."[109] The Italian Freemasons are only bringing to completion what the French Revolution began, because "The soldiers of modern civilization, the French, broke the hegemony of the barbarians. With their Herculean arms, they rolled back the stone from the tomb of those who have fallen asleep and the nations are waking."[110] Now the Jews are ready to succeed the Italians as the racial vanguard of revolution, just as the Italians succeeded the French. The future is being announced by Jewish movements. Hess cites Simon bar Kokhba and Shabbetai Zevi as avatars of the current messianic, i.e., revolutionary age:

> Once again in this age, during the vernal equinox of humanity, the great future which all of us are facing, is being announced by Jewish movements of which the world has taken little note, but which have no less meaning than those which took place during the period of transition in Jewish history from antiquity to the middle ages. Already at the beginning of the modern period we witnessed a messianic movement of the sort the world had not seen since the destruction of the Temple and the bar Kokhba rebellion, one which energized both oriental and occidental Jews, whose false prophet was Shabbetai Zevi and whose true prophet was Spinoza. Even our modern Sadducees, Pharisees and Essenes, by which I mean the Reform Jews, the Rabbinics and the Hasids, will disappear without a trace once our critical epoch, the last crisis of world history, has passed, after which the Nations, who have the Jews to thank for their historical religion, and with them the Jewish people as well will be reborn to new life. Judaism rejects both spiritualistic and materialistic sects. Jewish life is unitary, just like its God, and this unitary life is what is now reacting against modern Materialism, which is just the flip side of Christian spiritualism.[111]

Life is a direct result of race, which forms its social institutions according to innate faculties and inclinations. As a result, the Jewish penchant for revolution is inbred and ineradicable. Messianic biology is the true Jewish destiny. Now that the "spring of nationalism . . . approaches its fruitful summertime," the "modern society which was born out of revolution regenerates itself by itself; it reforms not by sewing new patches on old wine skins but by creating completely new situations."[112] The essence of modernity is revolution, which is also the racial heritage of the Jewish people, according to Hess. "As long

the Jews failed to recognize the essence of modernity, which was from beginning to end their own essence as well, they were simply carried along by the current of modern history."[113] All that remains is for the Jewish race to become conscious of its true revolutionary identity. To be saved, all the Jews need to do is become what they are. Since all of philosophy and morals is ultimately Jewish in Hess's view, the French were only imitating Jews when their philosophes overthrew their Catholic king:

> There is nothing in Christian morals, neither in the scholastic philosophy of the Middle Ages, neither in modern Philanthropy, and if I add to that the final manifestation of Judaism, Spinozism, nothing in modern philosophy which is not rooted in Judaism. The Jewish people was, up until the time of the French Revolution, the only race in the world which had both a national and a humanitarian cult. It is through Judaism that the history of mankind became a holy history, and by that I mean a unitary, organic process of development which began with the love of the family and which will not be completed until all of mankind becomes one family, whose limbs are united through the Holy Spirit, which is the creative genius of history.[114]

From the terminology that he uses, Hess is still clearly under the sway of Heine's teacher Hegel. He shares this debt with Marx. However, as we have seen, Hess, unlike Marx, felt that race, as a biological phenomenon, not class was the vehicle for the religion of history. Revolution is the soul or *genius movens* of world history. The Jews kept this spirit alive in secret when people like Pope Innocent III ruled over Europe. The proof that they were God's chosen people lay in the fact that they kept this spirit of rebellion and revolution alive in the face of what seemed like insurmountable odds. But ever since the French Revolution, that smoldering ember, the one preserved by the Jews in their secret shrines, has burst into flame again. It is now the sacred duty of the Jews as acolytes of what Hess calls "the religion of history" to join with the French and spread revolution to the rest of the world.

> As long as no nation other than the Jews had this national-humanitarian religion of history, the Jews were alone God's chosen people. But ever since the great Revolution, which has spread from France, we have in the French nation, as well and in other nations which have joined the French, noble rivals and true collaborators. With the final victory of these nations over the medieval reaction, the human aspiration, which I recognize wholeheartedly, will blossom and bear fruit.

According to Hess, "every modern race. . . has a special vocation as an organ of humanity."[115] As their special vocation, the Jews "have carried around with us the faith in the messianic epoch of the world since the beginning of history."[116] That messianic epoch has finally arrived, and the Jews will bring the age to its fruition by spreading revolution throughout the world. Those who don't see

this don't understand history. Those "who don't understand the revelation of the religious genius of the Jews" see nothing but chaos in the events around them. Those who do, understand that the 19th century is the messianic age, and that that age began with the French Revolution:

> This age began according to the tenets of our religion of history with the messianic age. It is the time in which the Jewish nation and all historical peoples are raised from the dead to new life, the age of "the resurrection of the dead," the "return of the Lord", and the new Jerusalem, and other symbolic designations. . . .The messianic age is the present age, which began to sprout with Spinoza and which entered world historical reality with the great French Revolution. The rebirth of the nations began with the French Revolution, thanks to the religion of history which came from the Jews.[117]

Nearly every Jewish scholar refers to Hess as a proto-Zionist, but as Frankel rightly points out, this is an anachronism. Zionism would not appear on the stage of world history for at least another 30 years. When it became a significant political movement, the Zionists appropriated his writings and deemed Hess a prophet. It would be more accurate to refer to Hess as a Jewish revolutionary, one more avatar of the Jewish revolutionary spirit which had emerged throughout history and which had caused the Jewish people so much sorrow. Hess was a prophet; he was the man who announced two of the most significant messianic movements of human history—Zionism and communism—movements which would occupy the full spectrum of Jewish political alternatives for the next century and a half, but he was also a revolutionary Jew with his feet planted firmly in the vocabulary of his age. As a result, his immediate prognosis was that "right now we are witnessing the final racial and class battles which will lead to a reconciliation of all opposites, and bring about an equilibrium between production and consumption."[118]

Like Vladimir Jabotinsky, one of the terrorists who was instrumental in the founding of the state of Israel, after him, Hess felt that the way to the promised land in Palestine led through the travails of revolution in Europe. The Jews had to emulate the French before they could have a land of their own because it was "France, dear Friend, France" who was "the hero and savior, who put our race back on the tracks of world history."[119] This is the case not only because "the way of culture in the desert [has been] made straight by the Suez canal, and by rail lines that connect Europe and Asia,"[120] but more importantly because "the idea of taking possession of our Fatherland can only be taken seriously in an age in which all rigidity has been broken. And that has happened in our day, not only among the Enlightened, but also among the pious Jews and Christians."[121]

In other words, revolution cannot succeed until the Jews have been liberated from the obscurantism of the shtetls of the East. The *conditio sine*

[illegible] which will enable the advent of the messianic age is "the liberation of the Jewish masses from a spirit-deadening formalism."[122] The Jews can only achieve national unity through revolution because revolution is their racial essence. "Every Jew," according to Hess, "even the baptized, is responsible for the rebirth of Israel,"[123] but the Jews can only reach this promised land by wading through the river of revolution, "by fighting for liberated national soil, by the annihilation of every race and class membership from within and without."[124]

In a way that was sure to antagonize the Germans who read his book, Hess praised the French for inaugurating the modern revolutionary era. France, under Napoleon, had "extend[ed] its salvific activity to the Jewish nation, after toppling the victorious armies of the modern Nebuchadnezzars from their thrones,"[125] but it was now up to the Jews to reciprocate by making the revolutionary cause their own. Since France got the idea of revolution from the Jews, it shouldn't be difficult to convince the Jews to become the revolutionaries they were *in potentia* all along, for as Hess asks, "What race is better suited for revolution than the Jews?"[126]

> It is up to France, to see the paths to India and China full of nations who are willing to follow France to the death in order to fulfill their historical task, which has been their lot since their great Revolution. What race is better suited to that task than the Jews, who have been called to the same mission from the beginning of history?[127]

The German nation was still smarting from the Napoleonic conquests. Eight years after the publication of Hess's book they would win a war and gain Alsace Lorraine from the French, creating further animosity. If Hess wanted to antagonize the Germans, who still had memories of Jewish collaboration with Napoleon in mind, he could have found no more effective way to do it than by linking Frenchmen and Jews in common revolutionary enterprise.

Which is precisely what Hess did: "Frenchmen and Jews!" he wrote sailing off into the empyrean on the wings of one more revolutionary fantasy, "They were made for one another. They complement each other by the differences which could not be united in one people. . . . The generous assistance, which France lent to the civilized peoples in their restoration of their nationhood, will never find a more grateful race than the Jews. . . . The Jewish people must first show themselves worthy of the rebirth of their world historical cult."[128]

As Voltaire said of God, if Hess didn't exist, German anti-Semites would have had to invent him because in Hess they found a writer who expressed their fantasies of the revolutionary Jew better than they could themselves. "Judaism is the religion of history," and Revolution is the essence of Judaism. The Enlightenment dream of Jewish assimilation which found its first expression in *Nathan der Weise*, found in Hess its assassin and the man who wrote its epitaph:

> Occidental Jews are still encased in an unbreakable crust, composed of the dead remains of the first stirrings of the modern spirit, from the organic calcified shell of an extinct rationalist Enlightenment which has not been melted by the fire of Jewish patriotism but can only be broken from pressure from without, whose force will exterminate anything which has no future. . . . race can emerge from the hearts of our modern cultured Jews only by way of a violent shattering stroke from without.[119]

The pressure from without was the revolutionary spirit which as of the 1860s was spreading through the shtetls of the Pale of the Settlement releasing destructive energy whenever it "shattered the protective shell of orthodoxy."